This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600052156P



VICTORIA
ALBERT
ANNE

THE NATIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

Civil, Military & Domestic.

WITH UPWARDS OF FIVE HUNDRED ENGRAVINGS

ILLUSTRATIVE OF ANTIQUITIES, SCENERY, MANNERS, CUSTOMS &c.

VOL. I.

KING JOHN SIGNING MAGNA-CHARTA

LONDON & GLASGOW:
WILLIAM COLLINS, SONS & COMPANY.

THE

NATIONAL

HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

Civil, Military, and Domestic,

FROM THE ROMAN INVASION TO THE PRESENT TIME;

WITH AN

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION,

BY

HENRY, LORD BROUGHAM;

ILLUSTRATED WITH FIFTY ENGRAVINGS

OF THE

MOST IMPORTANT EVENTS IN BRITISH HISTORY,

ENGRAVED BY DALZIEL, CHESHIRE, MILLER, &c., AFTER DRAWINGS BY SELOUS, WILKIE, ZWECKER, BAYES, HARLOWE, &c.,

AND UPWARDS OF

FIVE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS,

OF ANTIQUITIES, ARCHITECTURE, SCENERY, MANNERS, CUSTOMS, ETC.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

BY EDWARD FARR, ESQ.

LONDON AND GLASGOW:
WILLIAM COLLINS, SONS, & COMPANY.
1873.

226 l. 165

PREFACE.

THE importance of the study of History has been fully recognized by all intelligent and cultivated men. This arises not only from the interesting nature of the events recorded, and the characters depicted, but also from the fact, that in such study we see thoughts, opinions, and principles acting on society, and moulding and guiding the destinies of men and nations. The mind and imagination are thus far more powerfully and permanently impressed than when we are simply contemplating such influences in their more silent and abstract forms. We believe, were it in our power to resolve the influences which form character into their original components, to separate by nice analysis the threads of association and motive which make us what we are,—the statesman, the orator, the warrior, the public benefactor, would find that their career had been moulded, success attained, and good done, not through laborious drillings in abstract truth, but by some stirring example which had impressed the imagination in boyhood—some achievement of wisdom, some daring or chivalrous action, some winged word spoken by a living mouth, some trait, never forgotten, in the character, or incident in the life, of a Tell, a Hampden, or a Washington.

If an acquaintance, more or less exact, with the history of mankind in general, is indispensable to complete and harmonious culture, a knowledge of the history of his own country ought to be possessed by every one who lays claim to ordinary intelligence. Bold words, perhaps too bold, have been uttered by Mr. Carlyle, to the effect that every nation's history, well understood and interpreted, is its Bible. Holy Writ stands, we hold, apart from all other compositions; but it is a notable fact, that a large proportion of the Sacred Scriptures consists of the history of the Jewish nation and of the early Christians; and it is not only consistent with a reverent esteem for the Bible, but strictly and scientifically correct, to hold that the providential dealings of God with each nation have for it a special significance, and ought to be studied with religious earnestness and a sense of profound responsibility. With other branches of learning we may or may not be acquainted; but surely it is a disgrace in any man not to be acquainted with the history of his own country.

Much might be said as to the best mode in which to compose history, but we shall content ourselves with saying very little. The propriety of a division of labour, especially in treating the marvellously complex history of modern times, has long been recognized. No one man can be expected to treat a considerable period in the history of an important nation, in all its aspects, with thorough efficiency. To have the work well done, the whole must be mapped out into departments, and these committed to writers who may be presumed to possess a peculiar fitness for the task assigned them. On the advantages of such a method it is

unnecessary to enlarge. It has derived countenance more or less from the procedure of Henry, Mosheim, and other eminent historians. In one of his eloquent essays upon History, Mr. Carlyle sketches a few of the provinces into which the general historical domain might be profitably divided, and these correspond, in large measure, to those adopted in the following work.

The history of our country will be found here treated under periods. In dealing with each, the following division of topics has been adopted:—

CIVIL AND MILITARY HISTORY;	LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART;
LAW AND GOVERNMENT;	INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE;
RELIGION;	MANNERS, CUSTOMS, AND SOCIAL CONDITION.

These subjects have been treated, in connection with the earlier period of our national history, by EDWARD FARR, ESQ., Author of various popular Historical works; and FREDERICK MARTIN, ESQ., the well-known Author of the "Statesman Year-Book of Facts," &c. Of the Modern period, the Civil and Military History will be written by W. H. RUSSELL, ESQ., LL.D., whose works on the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny have attained a permanent place in the literature of England. Law and Government will be written by HENRY GLASSFORD BELL, ESQ., whose thorough command of these departments, and general literary accomplishments, are well known. Religion, Literature, Science, and Art, will be treated by PETER BAYNE, ESQ., A.M., who has devoted many years of his life to the study and discussion of these topics.

An important feature of the present work is the Historical Introduction, by HENRY, LORD BROUGHAM, in which that eminent Statesman traces, with his usual power and eloquence, the growth and development of our admirable Constitution through the long series of events and changes by which it has gradually risen to be the envy and admiration of the civilized world.

The Illustrations introduced into the work have been carefully selected, with a view to elucidate the most interesting events in English History, and to give the reader a pictorial view of many objects and scenes rendered famous by their association with memorable persons and transactions connected with our eventful history, and also to illustrate the progress of architecture, industry, and manners and customs. A series of Maps of Great Britain and our Colonial Empire will accompany the work; and for the purpose of reference, a full Index will be given in the concluding volume.

June, 1866.

CONTENTS.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, by LORD BROUGHAM, ... PAGE ix

ROMAN PERIOD.

History of Britain, from the Invasion of the Romans, B.C. 55, to the Saxon Period, A.D. 449.

CHAP. I.—Civil and Military History, ... PAGE 1
CHAP. II.—History of Laws and Government, . . . 24
CHAP. III.—History of Religion, ... 32
CHAP. IV.—History of Literature, Science, and Art, . . 39
CHAP. V.—History of Industry, Commerce, &c., . . 48
CHAP. VI.—History of Manners, Customs, &c., . . . 55

SAXON PERIOD.

History of Britain from the Arrival of the Saxons, A.D. 449, to the Invasion of the Normans, A.D. 1066.

CHAP. I.—Civil and Military History, ... 61
Egbert, ... 71
Ethelwulf, ... 72
Ethelbald and Ethelbert, ... 72
Ethelbert, ... 73
Ethelred I., ... 73
Alfred, ... 74
Edward the Elder, ... 83
Athelstane, ... 83
Edmund I., ... 85
Edred, ... 85
Edwy, ... 86
Edgar, ... 87
Edward, ... 90
Ethelred II., ... 91
Edmund II., or Ironside, ... 95
Canute, ... 95
Harold Harefoot, ... 97
Hardicanute, ... 98
Edward the Confessor, ... 98
Harold, ... 106
CHAP. II.—History of Laws and Government, . . . 111
CHAP. III.—History of Religion, ... 116
CHAP. IV.—History of Literature, Science, and Art, . . 127
CHAP. V.—History of Industry, Commerce, &c., . . 136
CHAP. VI.—The Manners and Customs of the Anglo-Saxons, 144

NORMAN PERIOD.

History of Britain from the Landing of William I., A.D. 1066, to the Death of King John, A.D. 1216.

CHAP. I.—Civil and Military History, ... 151
William I., ... 151
William II., ... 163
Henry I., ... 167
Stephen, ... 174
Henry II., ... 183
Richard I., ... 205
John, ... 211
CHAP. II.—History of Laws and Government, . . . 223
CHAP. III.—History of Religion, ... 229
CHAP. IV.—History of Literature, Science, and Art, . . 236
CHAP. V.—History of Industry, Commerce, &c., . . 244
CHAP. VI.—History of Manners, Customs, &c., . . . 249

HOUSE OF PLANTAGENET.

History of Britain from the Accession of Henry III., A.D. 1216, to the Deposition of Richard II., A.D. 1399.

CHAP. I.—Civil and Military History, ... 258
Henry III., ... 258
Edward I., ... 274
Edward II., ... 291
Edward III., ... 302
Richard II., ... 326
CHAP. II.—History of Laws and Government, . . . 344
CHAP. III.—History of Religion, ... 352
CHAP. IV.—History of Literature, Science, and Art, . . 362
CHAP. V.—History of Industry, Commerce, &c., . . 371
CHAP. VI.—History of Manners and Customs, . . . 378

HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK.

History of Britain from the Accession of Henry IV., A.D. 1399, to the Death of Richard III., A.D. 1485.

CHAP. I.—Civil and Military History, ... 389
Henry IV., ... 389
Henry V., ... 396
Henry VI., ... 408
Edward IV., ... 437
Edward V., ... 456
Richard III., ... 462
CHAP. II.—History of Laws and Government, . . . 479
CHAP. III.—History of Religion, ... 489
CHAP. IV.—History of Literature, Science, and Art, . . 502
CHAP. V.—History of Industry and Commerce, . . . 514
CHAP. VI.—History of Manners and Customs, &c., . . 526

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

	Page
Roman Galley,	4
Coway Stakes,	4
The Ancient Britons Acknowledging the Supremacy of Cæsar,	*to face* 5
Julius Cæsar,	5
Junction of the Thames and the Irwell,	8
Antiquities from the Thames,	9
Boadicea Haranguing her Troops,	*to face* 11
British War Chariot,	12
Wall of Severus,	17
Axe Heads,	20
Celts,	21
Spear Heads,	21
Departure of the Romans from Britain,	*to face* 22
Britannia,	23
Remains of a Roman House, London,	25
Hadrian,	29
Druids' Temple,	32
Druids' Writing Desk,	33
Astronomical Instrument,	40
Misletoe Plant,	41
Supposed Form of Ancient British House,	44
Roman Arch, Lincoln,	45
Celtic Harp,	48
Tin Mine, Cornish Coast,	49
British Pearls,	51
Ring Money,	52
London Stone,	53
Ancient British Canoe,	53
British Coracle,	53
Ancient British Cist,	56
Ancient Ornaments,	57
Ancient Bronze Bowl,	60
Saxon Warrior,	61
Anglo-Saxon King and Armour-bearer,	65
Ancient Armour,	69
Nottingham Castle,	73
Alfred the Great in the Neatherd's Cottage,	*to face* 76
Alfred's Jewel,	77
Saxon Ship,	80
Saxon Lantern,	81
Malmesbury Abbey,	85
Benedictine Monk,	88
King Edgar, Saxon Lady, and Page,	89
Rochester Castle,	92
Passage Gallery, Rochester Castle,	93
Silver Coin of Canute,	96
Winchester Cathedral,	97
Font, Dorchester Cathedral,	100
Entrance, Dover Castle,	101
The Crown Offered to Harold by the People.—Bayeux Tapestry,	104
Normans Preparing for Battle.—Bayeux Tapestry,	105
Seal of Edward the Confessor,	105
Feasting of the Normans at Hastings,	108
Orders Given for Erection of Camp at Hastings,	109
Golden Cross of St. Cuthbert,	112
Ealdorman,	113
Rochester Cathedral,	120
Music Bells,	133
Hand Organ,	133
Handmill,	137
Silver Coins of Alfred,	143
Saxon Female Costume,	145
Saxon Male Costume,	145
Ringed Mail Armour,	146
Saxon Vehicle,	149
Saxon Wheel-Plough,	150
The Tower, London,	152
Coronation of William the Conqueror,	*to face* 152
Nave, Durham Cathedral,	160
Seal of William the Conqueror,	161
Carlisle Castle,	164
Church of the Holy Sepulchre,	168
Abbey Church, Shrewsbury,	169
Geoffrey Plantagenet,	172
Salisbury Cathedral,	176
Oxford Castle,	177
Snowdon,	184
West Gate, Canterbury,	192
Murder of Thomas à Becket,	*to face* 193
Thomas à Becket's Chapel,	193
Helmets,	200
Round Tower, Windsor,	201
Coronation Chair,	205
Knight Templar,	208
Richard Cœur de Lion Beholding Jerusalem,	*to face* 208
Acre,	209
Clause of Magna Charta,	219
Norham Castle,	220
Crypt, Bell Tower, Windsor Castle,	221
Dominican Monk,	236
Cistercian Monk,	236
Cloisters, Gloucester Cathedral,	240
Norman Arches,	241
Abbey Gateway, Bury St. Edmunds,	241

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS—*continued.*

	Page
Norman Arch, Berkeley Castle,	242
Sarcophagus, Canterbury Cathedral,	243
Corn Hand-mill,	244
Cup, Glastonbury,	245
Silver Penny of Stephen,	248
Corn Sacks and Store,	252
Curfew Bell Tower,	253
Norman Male and Female Costumes,	253
The Quintain,	256
Sword Dance,	257
The Tower, from the Thames,	261
Westminster Hall,	264
The Barons' Hall, Rochester,	269
The First Parliament,	*to face* 270
The Bell Tower, Evesham,	272
Conway Castle,	277
Edward I. Presenting his Son to the Welsh,	*to face* 278
Linlithgow Palace,	288
Dumbarton Castle,	289
Bruce at Bannockburn,	*to face* 295
Limerick Castle,	296
King's Chamber, Newcastle,	297
Neath Abbey,	301
Corfe Castle,	304
Ship, time of Edward III.,	309
Neville's Tomb, Durham Cathedral,	316
The French King brought Prisoner to London,	*to face* 321
Ruins, Savoy Palace,	321
Tomb, Canterbury Cathedral,	325
Scarborough,	328
St. Alban's Abbey,	332
Richard II. and Wat Tyler,	*to face* 332
Eltham Palace,	336
Council House, Shrewsbury,	340
Milford Haven,	341
King and Council,	348
Parliament of the Period,	349
Convocation of Clergy,	353
Nave, Winchester Cathedral,	357
Lutterworth Church,	360
Friar Bacon's Study,	363
Gower's Monument,	366
Salisbury Cathedral, West Front,	368
Cloisters, Salisbury Cathedral,	369
Early English Capitals,	369
Windows, Fourteenth Century,	369
Ships, time of Richard II.,	373
Seal, Edward I.,	376
Penny, Edward I.,	376
Groat, Edward III.,	376
Tournament,	379
Inviting to a Feast,	380
Saying Grace,	380
Dining Room and Kitchen,	381
Ladies' Costume, Edward I.,	382
Male Costume, Edward II.,	382
Male Costume, Richard II.,	384
Female Costume, Richard II.,	384
Ladies' Head-Dresses,	384
Cardinals' Hats,	384
Mourning Habits, 1337,	385
Shield of John of Gaunt,	386
Bed,	386
Library Chair,	386
Archers,	387
Circular Chess-Board,	388
Draught-Board,	388
Shrewsbury Arms,	392
Prince Henry and Chief Justice Gascoigne,	*to face* 395
Cradle of Henry V.,	396
Ludlow Castle,	432
St. Mary's Hall, Coventry,	433
Pomfret Castle,	434
Font, Abbey Church, Tewkesbury,	448
Assassination of Henry VI.,	*to face* 449
Sanctuary at Westminster,	457
Gloucester Conducting Edward V. into London,	*to face* 458
St. Paul's Cross,	461
Battle of Bosworth—Henry VII. Proclaimed King,	*to face* 469
Palace in Edinburgh Castle,	474
Burning at Smithfield,	493
Lollards' Prison,	495
Caxton's Printing Office,	504
Doorway, King's College, Cambridge,	509
Eton College,	509
Houses of the Fifteenth Century,	511
Chantry of Henry V., Westminster,	512
Ships of the Fifteenth Century,	520
Artizans,	524
Noble of Henry V.,	525
Half Noble of Henry V.,	525
Angel of Edward IV.,	525
Seal of Edward IV.,	525
Ancient Cannon,	528
Movable Tower,	528
Male Costume, Henry IV.,	531
Female Costume, Henry IV.,	532
Male Costume, Edward IV.,	533
Female Costume, Edward IV.,	533
Male Costume, Henry VI.,	534
Female Costume, Henry VI.,	534
Law Costumes,	535
Black Armour Knight,	536

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

BY

HENRY, LORD BROUGHAM, D.C.L. Oxon., LL.D., F.R.S., Etc.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND IN THE ANGLO-SAXON TIMES.

The early history of every Constitution must of necessity be involved in great obscurity. Two causes contribute to keep us in ignorance and uncertainty respecting the origin, and even respecting the earliest stages in the progress of all political institutions.

In the *first* place, all Governments must have been established long before the period of written history, because men must have lived together in society, and even brought their civil polity to a considerable degree of maturity, before any writer devoted his labour to record their progress in the arts of government. The want of written annals is but ill supplied by tradition; for that can never mark the successive changes in the form of government, and must always confound together the dates of different events. Then the blank in authentic or accurate accounts is always supplied by a plentiful admixture of fables, feigned by the superstition or national vanity of the people, or invented by the mere exercise of imagination in the absence of true narrative. Hence the accounts which come down to the earliest historians are always a confused mass of facts and fictions, which they are little better able to digest and to purify than ourselves. Even the colonial establishments of both ancient and modern times form no exception to these positions, because the founders of them only carrying out with them a portion of the institutions already existing in the mother country, the true origin of the Colonial as well as of the Metropolitan Government is in truth one and the same.

But, in the *second* place, the province of History itself, after men have begun to write it, presents anything rather than a satisfactory or trustworthy record of the successive events which have been the origin of the constitutions ultimately found established in different countries. It is only in recent times that Historians have taken any care to describe the political constitutions of the nations whose annals they undertake to preserve. In ancient times, with scarcely any exception, and in modern times, until within the last two centuries, Historians assumed that all the civil institutions of the countries to which they belonged were matter of universal notoriety to the age in which they lived, and, moreover, regarding such subjects as of inferior interest to their readers, they confined themselves to describing the great events of war, or the sudden revolutions effected by violence, leaving us in the dark respecting the most important parts of the civil polity established in each era and country. Hence, while the Greek and the Roman records contain a full detail of the battles, the sieges, the violent seditions, the massacres, which disfigure the early history of our species, and from which no period of its annals is exempt, we are left in doubt or in the dark as to many points of extreme interest respecting the institutions by which men's rights were protected, or their duties enforced, or the exigencies of the public service met; and are fain to glean our knowledge of these truly important matters from occasional notices in the speeches that have been preserved, or from the discussions of philosophers on Moral and Political questions—discussions which always assume things to be known that have never reached our times. Of this many instances occur in our examination of the ancient constitutions. But the same defect is perceptible to a great extent in modern histories. The preservation of the laws made from time to time no doubt affords important materials, as do the records of political changes that have happened. But many things exist in every form of government which the records of statutes fail to represent; and he would have a most imperfect knowledge of any constitution who should confine his study of it to the written law.

It was only in the eighteenth century that the history of institutions, of manners, and of customs, what may be termed the General History of Society, began to be written. The brilliant success of Voltaire in his truly philosophical work, and of Robertson in his general view of European history, has founded a new and invaluable school of Political science—which the great failure of others has not been able to destroy. But whoever would learn the political annals of the nations composing the great European Commonwealth, will look in vain to their histories for information upon many of the most important branches of the subject. The debates of the English Parliament, and the controversies among party men and speculative reasoners, which existed in the seventeenth century, throw much light on the unwritten law of the constitution at all times; while we have already found how difficult it was to ascertain the most important particulars connected with the successive changes in the structure of the French Monarchy, from the entire want of the one of these sources of information, and the scanty amount of the other.

The Constitution of England, unless in the circumstance of our Parliamentary debates having for the last two centuries drawn its original principles and early history into public discussion, affords no exception to the general rule. The early period in which our civil institutions were founded is involved in great obscurity. The origin of these institutions, the shape which they at first assumed, the changes by which they were so moulded as to approach their ultimate condition, are all matters of doubt, and have given rise to controversies which there are no means of settling with any degree of satisfaction,—controversies through which the candid student of our political History, only anxious in the pursuit of truth, finds it impossible to trace his way, or to avoid being bewildered among conflicting assertions.

The first question that presents itself to the inquirer upon the early structure of the Constitution relates to the degree of freedom enjoyed by the People, and the extent of the power vested in the Sovereign. It is very natural for a nation which highly prizes its liberty, and values itself upon the superiority enjoyed till within the last half-century over all others, to plume itself also upon the length of time during which it has possessed so envied a distinction. A nation feels the same pride in this respect that a family does, and loves to trace back its nobility to a remote period of time, as individuals love to boast of the honours enjoyed by their remote ancestors. Hence, as might be expected, the English, and more especially that party among them which chiefly maintains popular rights, have fondly traced the origin of our free institutions to the most remote ages, and have easily lent themselves to the belief that there never was a period when a system of representative Government did not exist in the country. Under various names they consider a Parliament always to have formed a portion of the government, whether a Great Council or a Witenagemote, or a Michelgemote, or a Colloquium, or a Parliament.

In these theories there is some truth and some error. To hold that representation always existed, is manifestly absurd; it is a position borne out by no historical facts; it is even plainly contradicted by the known facts recorded within the period of authentic History. We may easily see the clearest proofs of this in tracing the origin of representation; we shall find that at the Conquest, and for nearly two centuries later, there were no representatives even of the counties; that the greater Barons or Peers sate in one Chamber with the lesser Barons or free tenants holding their lands, like the greater, directly or *in capite* of the Crown; that in the thirteenth century the counties began to send Knights as representatives of the lesser freeholders whose personal attendance was thus excused; that it was only towards the latter part of the century that the burgesses, or inhabitants of the towns, were represented; and that they, with the Knights representing counties, formed a body apart from the Peers, and had a chamber of their own.

It was therefore a most violent exaggeration into which Lord Camden fell when he affirmed, with undoubting confidence, that at all times every portion of England was represented in Parliament; or, as he phrased it, that "at no period was there a single blade of grass within the realm unrepresented." The antiquaries—of whose lore he spoke with a contempt equally dogmatical, as subverting our liberties by their "fantastical speculations"—both come far nearer the plain matter of fact, and do those liberties much better service when they show representation to be an improvement of comparatively recent date, and prove that if before the thirteenth century the country was represented, it was only virtually, and not actually, inasmuch as the towns sent no one to Parliament at all, and of the county members those only sate in it who attended in their own proper persons,—none but tenants in chief of the Crown having any place in the great council of the nation.

But if the reasoners who have held the higher language upon the antiquity of our Constitution, had only maintained that we have no record of any time in which the power of the Sovereign was absolute,

they would have asserted a truth which cannot be contested. There is every reason to believe that, from the earliest period of our history, the Monarch's authority was of a limited extent. In this respect our history differs not at all from that of the other Monarchies which arose out of the Feudal system, or indeed rather formed a part of that system. Those who fixed limits to the royal authority were in England, as everywhere else, the greater Barons, with their dependents or vassals, and aided, no doubt, also by the concurrence of the lesser landowners in their schemes of ambition, of resistance to the Prince, and of war with each other. Here, up to this point, the history of the English Government presents no exception to that of the other feudal kingdoms.

But the next position which we have to lay down presents a distinguishing feature in the English Government; for it is a truth to which our Constitutional History bears testimony almost as irrefragable, that the legislative power—in other words, the supreme power in the State—was shared at all periods of time by the great landowners, the Barons, and that it was probably shared, in some degree, by the lesser Freeholders also. This latter position may admit of somewhat more doubt; the share of the greater Barons seems to be incontrovertible.

In the times of the ancient Britons, before the Roman conquest, the whole country was under petty Princes, who waged continual war with each other, but united their forces by common consent under Cassibelaunus, King of Kent, to oppose Julius Cæsar. The Princes appear to have had less power over their subjects than those of Gaul. But of course anything like regular government was out of the question; only the leading men here, as among the Germans, exercised great influence as a Council of Officers under the Chief. The common people appear to have been almost in a state of slavery to the chiefs; but there can be no doubt that the same Councils which were held in Gaul and in Germany upon public affairs, attended by their chiefs, were also held in Britain. The Provincial Government of the Romans, of course, was established here after their conquest. Three legions of 42,000 men were stationed in the country, and the governor or proconsul exercised arbitrary power over the inhabitants. There were, in the latter times of the empire, three of these officers: one termed *Dux Britanniæ;* another, *Comes Britanniæ;* and the third, *Comes Littoris Saxonici*, as opposed to the Saxon invasions during the third century. After suffering the greatest oppressions under the Roman Government, and also from the incursions of the Scots and Picts in the north, when the increasing weakness of the empire rendered it impossible to aid them against the Barbarians, the Britons called in the assistance of the Saxons, who, imitating the policy of the rider in the fable, when the horse asked his help, subdued them, and retained peaceable possession of the country until interrupted, some centuries later, by the inroads of the Danes. The first invitation of the Saxons and Angles took place in consequence of a general council held by Vortigern, the most powerful of the British Chiefs, in the year 449; and the conquest of the whole country was not completed till the end of the next century. Eight separate kingdoms were then established, but the union of two of these made the whole amount to seven, usually called, from thence, the Heptarchy. This division of the country continued above two centuries; for although the seven kingdoms are commonly represented to have been united under Egbert in 827, it is certain that he only obtained a partial and uncertain dominion over the greater part of five; that he never had any footing in the sixth, and that he and his son Ethelwolf never even took any other title than King of the West Saxons. Indeed, long before his time, in the sixth century, the more powerful Kings of Wessex, and afterwards those of Northumbria, used to take the title of *Breitwalda*, or governors of Britain—a distinction which only ceased in 670, on the death of Oswy. Oswy was the seventh Breitwalda, and Egbert called himself the eighth. Alfred, his grandson, was the first prince who was called King of England, and his grandson Athelstane first really ruled over the whole United Kingdom in 927, calling himself sometimes King of the English, sometimes of England. The Saxon Monarchy was not of long duration: the Danes, in 1016, entirely defeated and conquered that people; and after a restoration for a very short period of the Saxon line, the Norman conquest, in 1066, finally overthrew it, establishing a foreign family upon the throne, and a foreign nobility in possession of the landed property of the whole country.

The Constitutions of the Saxons appear to have been the same in the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy, and afterwards in the United Kingdom. The descent of the Crown was irregular, because the ideas of men on hereditary succession were not matured; and when a prince left a son, more especially if that son was very young, a dispute frequently arose between his claims and those of his grandfather's second son—that is, the young prince's elder paternal uncle. The choice in such cases devolved upon the leading men—the chief landowners or thanes of the country; and even when there existed no dispute, the form of an election appears in all cases to have been observed,

and the Sovereign is always said in the chronicles to have been chosen King (*electus in Regem*). At his coronation, a ceremony deemed essential to the perfection of his title, and performed by the chief prelate, the primate, he was presented to the assembled people, who, however, never had any real voice in his election, but only by their acclamations gave an affirmative answer to the question put, asking if they approved, or took, or acknowledged him for their King. The power of the King never was absolute, nor anything approaching to it, but it was great, and his influence was greater. He had not only far larger possessions than any of the thanes or lords; his possessions were nearly equal to those of them all put together. Thus in the kingdom of Kent there were 430 places, or estates, and of these 194 belonged to the King. The rest were divided among two Prelates, as many Abbots, the Queen Dowager, and six Thanes, making in all eleven principal proprietors, beside whom there were smaller owners or sub-tenants, holding of the eleven thanes, as these held of the Crown.

In war the King commanded all the forces; he was the supreme judge, receiving appeals from all other judicatures, and sharing in all the fines paid upon conviction, according to the usual Saxon and, indeed, feudal practice of commuting all punishments whatever for fines. The great officers—the Earl, Eorlderman, or Governor of the county—the Gereefa, Sheriff, or Viscount under him—the Boroughreeves—the Judges—were all appointed by the King, and removable at his pleasure. I speak of the general state of the prerogative, although by the laws of the Confessor the Herctochs, or Dukes, and Sheriffs, are said to be chosen by the freeholders in the yearly folkmote. But in earlier times the Crown clearly had the appointment, and Alfred is recorded by Asser, a contemporary writer, to have removed all the ignorant eorldermen, and replaced them with others. He could grant "his peace"—that is, a protection from the pursuit of enemies—to any one, and demand money or service for it; and within four miles of his Court all were secure. His first vassals did him homage by attending three times a year on his Court, and he had a right to their services in war, with those of their sub-vassals or retainers, according to the immemorial Saxon and, indeed, feudal usage, which annexed military service to the tenure of all lands, the service of the tenant *in capite* being due to the King, that of the sub-tenant to his Thane, Hlafod, or Lord. But except arming his immediate retainers, the King had no standing army or regular guard. The Danish Princes introduced this practice, probably from the insecurity of their conquest, keeping on foot a guard called *Thingmann*, or *Thinglate*, of 3,000 men, selected from their whole forces, for whose government Canute compiled a code of rules. But this was an institution unknown to the Saxon polity, or even to the Norman, after the Conquest. With all these prerogatives and means of influence, it is plain that the Sovereign's authority must have been very extensive.

The legislative power, however, appears never to have resided in the monarch. Great as his influence was, and likely to give him overwhelming power in passing laws, he nevertheless must resort to his council, or gemote, to make them. There is no trace of any period at which their share in passing laws did not belong to the *witan*, or wise men, or councillors of the king. These formed his council; they were never very numerous, seldom exceeding thirty, never sixty; and the laws were made in the joint names of them and the king. Thus we find Ina, King of Wessex, in 688, making seventy-nine laws at his witenagemote, "with the advice of his prelates, eorldermen, wisemen, and clergy." So Edgar, in 971, long after the union of the Heptarchy, speaks of the laws which had been made by him and his witan (Ll. Sax., 80), and this form, as well as the substance, was universally preserved. As for taxation, the royal revenues formed the main body of the public income, and the services of the crown vassals superseded salary in the civil as well as pay in the military department. But direct taxes were occasionally levied frequently, and by the king without consent of the witenagemote; though certainly the most considerable of them, the Danegelt, originally raised in 991, to buy off with tribute the Danish invasion, was imposed by the witenagemote. It was continued, after many promises to repeal it, by successive sovereigns, until the reign of Henry II., when it was finally abolished. One source of revenue, however, appears in these times always to have been under the immediate power of the King; he levied duties of customs upon imported goods. His officers also raised contributions on the monasteries and rich proprietors, both the landowners in the country and the burghers in towns. As for the advantages which he reaped from the fines paid by his vassals on succession to or alienation of their fees, as well as from the marriage and wardship of minors, these were rather part of his landed property than of his revenues, and were equally enjoyed by the other lords of the soil. The regular revenue chiefly consisted of the royal property and of the direct taxes which the witenagemote raised. It must further be observed that, beside sharing the legislative power, the witenagemote also shared the executive functions of the government. By degrees they seem to have had a

voice in the choice of governors and sheriffs of counties. All great acts of State were performed in their meetings. Treaties were signed by them as well as by the king; and the power of making both war and peace became vested in them jointly with the sovereign. Indeed, the necessity of having their concurrence when the king had no standing army, and could only rely on his own vassals for service in war, must at all times have made it highly expedient to act in concert with the great allodial proprietors, who owed him no military service other than they might voluntarily undertake; and hence a reference of all questions of peace and war to their assembly appears to have become a necessary course of proceeding. Even in other countries, where the States had less regular power, they were convened on such occasions.

In France the sovereigns had in early times a means of maintaining their power and of reducing the assembly of their States to insignificance, which our sovereign never enjoyed. This power was curbed by that of the great feudatories, the six other princes, who formed, as it were, members of a great federal community; and accordingly the English sovereigns were more powerful in proportion to their great vassals than the French. But a very material difference existed in the relations in which these princes stood to their councils or states. The Imperfect Federal Union in France produced its usual effects, and enabled the king to overpower any one province by the force which he derived from the rest. Hence, when the States of one rejected a law, or refused supplies, he had recourse to the others. So would it have been in England had the division of the Heptarchy continued, and the King of Wessex been only the most powerful of the seven princes. Happily for both our regular government and our legislative freedom, the whole were early moulded into one. The sovereign could not appeal from one to the others: he was forced to consult the general council; he was obliged to share with them his legislative functions; and their voice became a real and effectual control upon his power, instead of falling into a mere form, or little better, as in France, where the States were only assembled to aid the King with their information, or to prepare the way for their co-operation in his wars, or to hear him publish such ordinances as he was pleased to frame for the government of his dominions.

After the Norman Conquest the Royal authority was greatly increased, and came, notwithstanding the legislative power of the great Council, now called the Parliament, greatly to exceed that of the French Monarchs. Before the Conquest the most effectual check to it arose from the consolidation of landed property, of many great fiefs, in the hands of a very few great lords. As long as these fiefs were vested in a great number of Crown feudatories, there was no chance of their offering any resistance to the far superior resources of the sovereign. But in the tenth century three nobles, Godwin, Leofric, and Siward, had engrossed so large a portion of the country, with the fourteen or fifteen earldoms, conferred upon them and their families, that they more than overmatched the King, whose principal security lay in fomenting divisions among them. The whole spirit of the Saxon institutions was indeed eminently aristocratic, like those of all the feudal Monarchies. Not only the privileges of the great men, the Thanes, were ample, but there was a regard had to rank and blood running through every arrangement of the State policy. The violation of an *ethel* born or noble woman was paid for by a higher *murds* than that of an *un-ethel* or common person. The murder of all persons was in like manner paid for by a *were* or *were-geld*, nicely adjusted to their relative rank. Nay, the testimony of persons was weighed in the same patrician balance, the oath of a tenant in chief, a king's thane, being of equal avail with that of six carles or peasants, and that of an eorlderman being equal to that of six thanes. A strange instance of this is preserved in the Saxon Chronicles. One Alfnoth sued the Abbey of Romsey for a piece of land; a jury of thirty-six thanes were about to decide the cause, and had retired, when Alfnoth, the demandant, challenged the tenants, the Monks, to prove their title by oath; the Eorlderman, patron of the Abbey, interposed, and the Court held his oath to be decisive, giving judgment for the Monks, and condemning Alfnoth to forfeit his goods and chattels for his false suit.

It is clear that the Saxon Government was an Aristocratic Monarchy, a Feudal Aristocracy in the strictest sense of the word. The whole power in the State was shared between the Sovereign and the nobles, clerical and lay. The King had much opposition to encounter from their great possessions, from the numerous free followers over whom they exercised an absolute control, from the still more numerous hordes of serfs whom they possessed in property, and who were for the most part attached to the soil, of which they were the only cultivators, from the warlike habits of these chiefs, and the habitual exercise of violence in which they lived, reduced into a system, and termed the right of private war. The superstitions of an ignorant people gave the priests an ascendant which interposed another kind of check upon the Prince's authority; while the legislative functions

of the State, what is, properly speaking, the supreme power, was shared by the King with the assembly of the Prelates and temporal Lords. With all these checks to his power it was still very great, from his ample possessions, his numerous vassals, and the divisions of those chiefs who were his natural adversaries. But to represent his prerogative as unlimited, and his government as despotic, would be a gross abuse of language; it would indeed argue an entire ignorance of the Anglo-Saxon story.

Yet he would not commit a much less considerable error who should represent, as some partizans of popular rights have done, this ancient constitution as Mixed in the modern sense of the term, and containing the democratic principle which grew up with it in a later age. Nothing can be more certain than that the people, the commons, had no share whatever, direct or indirect, in the government. Nothing can be more manifest than that there was neither actual nor virtual representation in its structure; and that neither the lesser freeholders attended the Witenagemote in person, nor the burghers either personally or by deputy. They who have fondly imagined that they could trace in those remote times any semblance of the Constitution now established among us, have bewildered themselves in obscure paths, where the lack of light enabled their fancy to conceive things that had no real existence. They, therefore, in exerting all their ingenuity, whether to embody the creations of their imagination, or pervert historical facts to suit a particular theory, have, with the best intentions towards popular rights and free institutions, done a very unacceptable service to the cause they patronized. Whosoever founds his esteem of any constitution upon the remote antiquity of its origin may depend upon it that he of necessity limits its approaches to perfection, and restricts within narrow bounds his own efforts for its improvement. Besides, the institutions of a rude age must needs be most imperfect, and little suited to the wants of a society advanced in civilization and refinement; and if those things alone are to be valued and maintained which have had their existence among barbarians, civilized men must of necessity abandon the precious results of political experience. Numberless were the evils entailed on the community by the feudal aristocracy which formed our more ancient Constitution. It may be fairly questioned if any society above the condition of men in the rude state, ever existed in a more wretched condition than that of England at the very period to which those reasoners, of whom I have just spoken, are so fond of bidding us look for the genuine principles of our free Constitution.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND UNDER THE ANGLO-NORMAN MONARCHY.

THERE can be no doubt that William was enabled to consolidate and extend the Royal authority, from the period of his accession to the Crown. But much controversy has been raised upon the line of policy which he pursued, and even upon the course of his public conduct. While some have contended that he entirely changed the ancient policy of the realm, introduced the feudal system which had been established in Normandy, and fortified his authority by the extirpation of the ancient nobility and the transfer of all the landed property to his followers,—another class of reasoners have denied that he effected any change at all in the ancient Saxon institutions, and have strenuously contended that he obtained the Crown, not by his victory over Harold, but by the will of Edward the Confessor, arguing that *conqueror* means in fact only *conquestor*, a person who succeeds by devise, or by any other mode of purchase, as contradistinguished from one who takes by inheritance. Some indeed (even Lord Coke) have been so inexcusably careless in their statements as to regard his title in the light of a devise, or at least of an appointment by the Confessor to him as one of the inheritable branches of the Saxon royal family; and some, in answering them, have fallen into an almost equal error by not adverting to the canons which regulate the descent of land.

Both these views of the subject must be regarded as exaggerated and erroneous. The record of *Domesday Book* clearly shows that many persons retained their property who had held it in the Confessor's time; and although, in consequence of the rebellion which took place during his absence in Normandy, the greatest changes took place in the distribution of landed property from the number of confiscations which ensued, there seems no sufficient ground for the charge brought against him of encouraging disaffection underhand, in order that he might have a pretext for making an universal transfer of landed property to the Normans. On the other hand, to deny that the military force which he introduced into the country, and the possession of his foreign dominions, enabled him to curb the Barons, and exert a much more vigorous rule than the English had hitherto known, would be shutting our eyes to the obvious facts of the case. The never-failing consequences of the Imperfect Federal Union were certain to flow, from the sceptre being in the hands of a prince who held on the Continent a Principality equal to one-third of the French

Monarchy. For nearly three centuries the English monarchs were endowed with these resources; and the event to which they owed their crown, a military conquest, with the constant presence of foreigners surrounding their persons, as well as the possession of so vast a proportion of the property of the country by those foreigners and their descendants, made the exercise of arbitrary power a far easier and safer thing than it had been under the native princes. Another change took place of great moment, and of extensive influence in augmenting the power of the sovereign. It is certainly most incorrect to represent the Conquest as having introduced the feudal policy; but it is certain that the Normans had established that scheme of government much more systematically and fully than any other people. Consequently, William never rested till he had moulded the less perfect Feudalism of the Anglo-Saxons after the Norman model. Allodial proprietors were tempted by offers of protection, and wearied out by vexatious proceedings, till they surrendered their independent titles and became the more considerable sub-vassals or tenants in chief of the Crown, the less considerable becoming vassals of other great lords, who themselves held of the sovereign. The Conqueror derived from hence no little addition both to the splendour of his Court and the real power of his office; for all his vassals held by military service, and each when he took the field was attended by his own vassals or sub-vassals.

The vast possessions of the king and his family must have prodigiously strengthened his authority. William had 1,432 manors all over England; his brother Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, 450; Geoffrey, 280; Robert, Earl of Mortagne, 937—making in all no less than 3,099 manors belonging to the family, beside the sixty-eight royal forests, as well as many parks and free chases. Nor must we omit a most important change in the allegiance of the vassals introduced by the Conqueror, and calculated materially to curb the power of the Barons. Formerly the vassal swore to his baron fealty absolutely; he was even forced to follow him in rebellion against the Sovereign, and his oath of fealty to the Sovereign contained an exception of his duty to his liege lord. The Conqueror would not suffer any such limited or divided allegiance; he required all to owe him fealty without any exception; and he forfeited the lands of the sub-vassal, as well as those of the vassal himself, if the tenant followed his liege lord in rebellion against the King, the universal overlord of the realm.

It has been said that Normandy was rather an apparent than a real increase of the English Sovereign's power; and of this opinion is Mr. Hume (*Hist.*, vol. i., App. 1). It cannot be denied that the Norman Barons, always aided by the French King in their attempts at throwing off the Duke's yoke, gave frequent occasion of annoyance to their prince, and often distracted his attention from the management of his English affairs. Yet no one can doubt that he derived considerable accession of power from so noble a principality: he often used his foreign troops directly in the subjugation of his English Barons; and it is certain that the first establishment of a constitution, nearly resembling our present system, was after that duchy and all the continental dominions had been severed from the English Crown.

But nothing certainly can justify those who have contended, on the other hand, that there were no limits whatever affixed to the power of the Sovereign after the Conquest. The monarch was very powerful; he was not absolute: and this leads us to consider the only, but the material check to his power, beside the mere force of the wealthy Barons, at all times more or less a restraint upon the Prince in every feudal Monarchy—I mean, of course, the General Council, whose interposition was always held necessary for the making of laws.

This body had now changed its name, and was called by the Norman term of *Parliament*, in Latin *Colloquium*, instead of the Saxon Witenagemote or Michelgemote. In some sort, too, its composition had undergone a change; but rather in appearance than in reality. The sounder opinion seems to be, that before the Conquest its members were the Prelates and the great allodial proprietors, and that the vassals of the king did not form a part of it. This is certainly the subject of controversy; and they who deny the position have at least to urge in support of their opinion the great importance of the Crown vassals, the powerful tenants *in capite*, and the likelihood that the King, who alone had the power of summoning the Council, would call these his vassals to assist. But be this as it may, no doubt can exist that after William had, about the twentieth year of his reign, completed the feudalization of the whole kingdom, and converted all the allodial into feudal holdings, the Council was composed of the Bishops, Abbots, and great Barons, tenants in chief of the Crown, who were required to attend their Lords' Court or Parliament three times a year, at the great festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Midsummer, as the Gemotes had been held before the Conquest at the same seasons. The numbers who attended the meetings were not great. The whole Barons of the realm were only, according to the most accurate enumeration, 605, of whom 140 were ecclesiastical; but a very large proportion, in consequence of their distant residence,

never attended the court. The stated meetings were probably occupied chiefly with matters of form and routine, while the important concerns of the kingdom were reserved for occasional meetings, which the Prince summoned when he found that he wanted their aid in his wars, or their assent in making laws and bringing great offenders to punishment.

It is chiefly from the interposition of these occasional assemblies, whenever matters of importance were to be transacted, that we learn the strength of the Parliament, and can estimate the degree in which the Royal Prerogative was limited by the established Constitution, subject to one remark which I shall find it necessary afterwards to subjoin. Let us mention a few of the principal occasions on which the very imperfect history of our early Constitution has preserved the memory of this parliamentary interference, and we shall be convinced that though the Conquest consolidated and extended the prerogative, it did not materially break in upon the functions and authority of the Great National Council.

When the Conqueror had nearly matured his plan for feudalizing the kingdom, he assembled a Parliament in London; and the country was divided into Knights' fees, the whole landowners, as well clerical as lay, being obliged to send for each fee—that is, each five hides, or 600 acres of land—a Knight equipped for the field to serve during forty days. This raised a body of 60,000 horse, there being 60,215 Knights' fees, whereof 20,015 were in the hands of the clergy.

One of the most certain occasions of calling a Parliament was the death of the King; when the old form of election was restored; and, indeed, as all of the Conqueror's successors, except Henry II.—that is, William Rufus, Henry I., Stephen, Richard, and John —were usurpers upon the rightful heirs, the assent of the Council became a material confirmation of a bad title. Thus William II. was chosen according to his father's dying request, Robert, his elder brother, being set aside. Stephen was crowned without any Parliament, but he convoked soon after a Synod of the Clergy, who assumed to dispose of the Crown. The Empress Maude had been acknowledged Henry's next successor at a Parliament held nine years before his death. On Henry II.'s decease the Queen convoked a Parliament to receive Richard I., and fix his coronation. At his death John held one at Southampton, which gave him the preference over his nephew Arthur, the rightful heir to the crown.

It is manifest that little or no reliance can be placed upon such appeals to Parliament, as evincing the legal structure of the Constitution; because the power of the great Barons was such as made it necessary for the Sovereign who would succeed upon an infirm title, to conciliate as many of them as he could; and no better way presented itself of strengthening a defective claim to the Crown than obtaining the consent of a Council composed of those Barons and the heads of the Church. There seems great reason for believing that this also was the main, if not the only, reason for assembling Parliament when any measure of policy or new law was to be sanctioned; and this is the remark subject to which I before stated the proposition, that appeals to Parliament were evidence of some power existing in the Constitution, independent of and even superior to the King's. It is possible that this was rather an expedient to which the King resorted, in consequence of the power and wealth vested in the Barons, than an acknowledged and fundamental principle of the Constitution. Nevertheless, the appeal to these assemblies on all important occasions, whether executive or legislative, is unquestionable.

When a prince was disposed to make any grant or concession to the people, it seems not to have been held necessary that a Parliament should be summoned. This arose from the original principle of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman legislation. The law was held to be the King's decree; he made it generally on the petition of the Witan, or great lords and prelates; but he might also make it of his own free will, provided it was a concession to the nation, which might be presumed as of course to meet with their consent. The modern constitution retains this form, but extends it to all cases, as well those in which the prince yields something, as those in which he claims something. According to this view of the matter, Henry I. promulgated his famous Charter, renewing and confirming the old Saxon laws and those of the Confessor, of which we have no account, except that of Henry's confirmation. It is a very important statement in this charter, that all the alterations made by the Conqueror in Edward's laws are distinctly stated to have been made with the consent of the Barons as well as the Prelates.

The treaty (1153) between Stephen and Henry II. was ratified in an assembly of Prelates and Barons, who witnessed the charter then granted by Stephen. Stephen held three other councils, in which he agreed to confirm all the rights granted by Henry I. to the nation.

The celebrated Constitutions of Clarendon, by which the clergy were subjected to the jurisdiction of the temporal courts, were made at a Parliament attended by thirty-seven Barons and eleven Counts.

In 1191 a Parliament was held against the usurpation of Longchamp, in Richard I.'s absence, and to

appoint a council of regency. In 1205 a Parliament at Winchester ordered every tenth knight in the realm to be raised and mounted at the charge of the other nine, as a force to aid in recovering the continental dominions of the Crown, and required every man, on an enemy landing, to rise and serve on pain of perpetual slavery with a heavy poll tax. This Parliament is said to have been attended by the Prelates, Barons, and "all the faithful people of the King," which last term means only, as we have frequently shown, that the assent of all not summoned was assumed. When, in 1213, John surrendered the kingdom into the hands of the Pope, and agreed to hold it as a fief, doing him homage as his liege lord, a council of the Barons and Prelates was held, and two Bishops, nine Earls, and three Barons, signed the instrument. Nor were the Barons willing to forget this transaction, or indisposed to avail themselves of its disgraceful import when it suited their purpose. Soon after, they appealed to Pope Innocent, as their liege lord, against John, for whom, however, his Holiness not unnaturally decided.

Although it seems to have been understood that all general laws must have the consent of the Parliament, it seems equally clear that the limits of the Royal authority in regard to taxation were very imperfectly defined, especially in the earlier period of the Anglo-Norman monarchy; yet it is not very easy to determine whether the prince in his exactions was committing an usurpation or only acting according to his prerogative. The Conqueror and his successors, besides their exactions from their vassals in the name of marriage, wardship, and the fines which they levied upon them on many other accounts, also levied tolls at fairs and markets, and on the passage of goods over bridges. No ancient charter granting a right of market with tolls, pickage, and stallage, ever purports to be by consent of Parliament. Customs were also levied on goods imported and exported at the havens of the realm. On towns, especially those in the demesne lands of the Crown, a tallage, in the nature of excise, was levied; and the inhabitants used to offer a composition, which occasionally was refused. The Conqueror, of his own authority, revived the payment of Danegelt, which the Confessor had remitted; and he is said to have raised by such means the incredible sum of nearly £11,000,000 of our money. One of the provisions of Henry I.'s charter was a restriction of the Crown's power of fining. Instead of the culprit being in the King's mercy, as had been the case under his father and brother, that Prince restored the Saxon *were gelds*, which ascertained the amount of fine for each offence. He also provided that no new taxes should thenceforth be imposed; and he materially lessened the burden of the feudal incidents.

Yet, notwithstanding this charter, the result of the infirmity of his title at the beginning of his reign, his extortions were fully equal to those of his predecessors; although, from the Barons making no complaint, it is probable that he confined himself to oppressing the inferior classes and the towns. He also kept bishops' sees vacant three and even five years, during which he received all their revenues; and sometimes he seized all a prelate's property at his decease. Canons being made against the marriage of the clergy, he sold at a high price licenses to break these. Desiring to raise a large sum, by fining the parochial clergy who had transgressed some canon, and finding this yield very little, he at once, and of his own authority, raised a general tax upon them, and called it a fine for breach of the canons. It is certain that, with great talents and address, he was one of the most unprincipled and tyrannical princes that ever sate upon the English throne.

The quarrels in which Henry II. was constantly engaged with the Church, probably restrained his violent and cunning nature so far as to prevent him from exciting general odium by interfering with the property of his subjects. But his successor, the favourite theme of praise with all our romance-mongers (Sir Walter Scott included), the gallant Cœur-de-Lion, was the most rapacious prince of his age. His shameless sale of Earldoms for money, and his restoring to the Scots their castles, long in the hands of the Crown, for large ransoms to feed his extravagance, as well as his emancipating them from their fealty to the English Sovereign, are acts of as scandalous and as mean profligacy as any which his despicable successor ever committed. The regent, De Burgh, whom he left to scourge the country when he went abroad in 1194, is said to have raised in two years a sum equal to eleven millions of our money. The exactions of this functionary drove the citizens of London to resistance, and Fitzosbert's rebellion was the consequenee. The Council of Regency in 1193, for Richard's ransom, levied a tax of 20*s.* on every knight's fee, and 25 per cent. on all income, ecclesiastical as well as lay. They appear to have had no Parliamentary authority for this; although they were named to the Regency by the Parliament held in 1191, as has been already stated. Following their example, John, in 1199, soon after his accession, levied a seventh of the income as well as the personality of his Barons, by way of penalty for their having deserted him in his disastrous Norman campaign. In short, with the exception of the Parliament

held at Nottingham in 1194, of spiritual and temporal Peers, we see hardly any example of a tax imposed by the National Council. That assembly imposed a tax upon land. The numbers which attended it, however, are a proof how little the principles of the Constitution were understood, or the interference of the Parliament valued; only fifteen Peers of both kinds, lay and clerical, were present. It appears that in England, as in France, a semblance rather than the reality of general assent to taxes was alone required for their being imposed. The great difference between the two constitutions was that the general laws appear in England always to have been made in the National Assembly or Parliament; while in France the King and his Council did no more than promulgate their edicts to the General Assembly, making sure of its assent, if indeed that assent was ever asked, of which there remains nothing like evidence.

The power of the Crown in respect of the Church formed in these times a very important article of the Constitution. In England, as in all other countries since the Establishment of Christianity, the Bishops were originally the mere overseers of the clergy, and possessed of no temporal wealth or power under a religion of which poverty was the chief characteristic; and they were chosen partly by the clergy, and partly by their lay flock. But in proportion as their importance increased, the Church showed a desire to exclude the laity from interfering in the choice, making a decree in the Council of Constantinople, 869, against all lay votes at elections, and also against the Chapters receiving any royal nomination. At the same time the sovereigns evinced an equal disposition to interfere with their choice of prelates. Sometimes they accomplished, by main force, their purpose of directing the election; more frequently by influence. In Spain alone was the power of appointment vested directly in the sovereign, by a grant of Urban II., in 1088. In France, although the princes of the two first races assumed the nomination, they afterwards yielded it, at least nominally, to the clergy. In England the right of the Chapters was not denied; but then the King claimed two important privileges; he insisted upon his license to elect being necessary before the Chapters could proceed, which gave him the previous power of recommending whom he pleased, and he then required the presentment of the prelate when chosen for his confirmation or acceptance, which gave him a veto on the election in the last stage. The monasteries in some cases claimed the right to the exclusion of the secular clergy, a claim admitted by even the stoutest advocates of the Romish Church to be wholly preposterous. The quarrel between John and the See of Rome began from the monks of Christ Church claiming to elect the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Pope allowing this claim upon an appeal to him by all parties. The Anglo-Norman Kings may be said substantially to have directed the choice of all their prelates, though not to have directly named them. On particular occasions they made their appeal to the Great Council of the Barons, or Parliament, as when William the Conqueror appointed Lanefranc in 1070, by consent, it was said, of the Barons, probably because he was a foreigner, being a native of Pavia. The Barons appear occasionally to have interfered in this matter without being consulted; for we are told that they combined against Guitmond, to whom the King had offered an English see, which he refused on the ground that the King had no right to impose superiors on the clergy; and this answer was said to have been so distasteful to the Barons, that they drove him from Normandy, after preventing him from being raised to the See of Rouen.

The only instance in which the Anglo-Norman Kings lost any of the Prerogatives which those of the Saxon times had possessed, was on the Earldoms becoming hereditary, as in Normandy, instead of being, as formerly, conferred for life only. This difference was probably more in name than in substance; for the Earl's son must generally have been so much more powerful than the rest of the Barons in the district as to insure his nomination upon his father's decease. But, even were it otherwise, we may easily perceive that, with such influence over the clergy, with the direct power of appointing to all judicial and other executive offices, with their exorbitant landed property, and their numerous retainers, to say nothing of their privilege of interfering with the course of justice, and thereby also with property, they must have possessed a power so extensive as to reduce the privileges of the subject within narrow limits.

There are two tests of the extent to which Royal prerogative is enjoyed in any community. The one is the power of making, or concurring in making, the laws by which the State is governed; the other is the power of ruling arbitrarily, so as to set at defiance any laws which may nominally exist for the government of the State. The former in theory may appear to occupy a larger space, because the legislative, in truth, means the supreme power in every country. But the force of the law itself, and consequently the value of the legislative authority, is truly tested by the latter circumstance, inasmuch as the silence of the law before the Monarch sets him above it; and if all his other

attributes enable him to defy it, there is but little lost to him in having no power to change its provisions. Practically he may be absolute, though forming part of a constitution theoretically limited; not to mention that, if the existing laws do not interpose obstacles to his tyranny, it signifies very little that he should be unable of his own mere authority to change them by new enactments.

If we apply these principles to the prerogative of the Anglo-Norman Crown, we shall find little reason for believing it to have been of a very limited nature. The Princes who reigned from the Conquest to the granting of the Great Charter were, in the strictest sense of the word, tyrants; and Stephen, were he excepted from this description, owed his curbed authority to the constant rebellion of his Barons, and his disputed succession to the Crown, which filled his reign with anarchy, and covered the country with desolation. These Princes not only displayed the fiercer disposition of tyrants, with the caprice of their ungovernable humours, but they were constantly gratifying their arbitrary or cruel propensities at the expense of their subjects, and without exciting resistance or suffering restraint. The Conqueror, not content with possessing sixty-eight forests, with other old parks and rights of free chase for the amusement of hunting, to which, like all his race, he was passionately addicted, threw into a New Forest (the name it still bears) great part of the fine county of Hants, thirty miles square in extent. This operation was repeated in other districts by his sons and grandsons, and it implied the destruction of all the property within the district thus seized, the razing houses and cottages to the ground, the throwing lands out of tillage, the expulsion, and often the destruction, of the inhabitants. A promise to abstain from such waste was frequently made by these Princes when they had any point to gain, as to excite a spirit of hostility to the refractory Barons; and it was as often broken as made. At length the Charter of the Forest was extorted from John; its effect was to disafforest all that had been thus laid waste since Henry II.'s time, and it prevented the future spread of this intolerable mischief. These princes often prohibited under severe penalties any person from hunting on his domains, or granted to one the exclusive right of chase over another's property,—a right not yet wholly extinguished in all parts of the island.

But the worst of the Conqueror's crimes remains to be told, and the one which most strikingly proves under how little restraint the caprice and the cruelty of the Norman Princes were placed by the Constitution, how much soever they may have been occasionally thwarted by their Nobles, barbarians as cruel, as overbearing, and as lawless as themselves. He resolved to draw a zone of desolation—a desert country—between his dominions and the northern tribes, who had given him trouble by their incursions; and accordingly he dispersed over the northern counties bands of soldiery, with orders to burn, sack, and ravage the land, sparing neither man nor beast. The whole country between York and Durham was thus laid waste; upwards of 100,000 persons of all ages and both sexes, not enemies, but subjects, were slain; and a century afterwards the traces of this awful devastation were discernible on the whole of that road for above seventy miles. When we hear of Eastern Despots, we must confess that they would be greatly slandered by any comparison of the Norman king's conduct with theirs. No instance is on record of any Oriental Prince ever thus treating the territory and the people subject to his dominion; their ravages are confined to hostile countries and inimical nations.

William Rufus passed his short reign in the unbridled gratification of his voluptuous passions and his cruel disposition; butchering prisoners with his own hand; laying waste districts to extend his parks; putting out the eyes of his captives when they were of rank—an Oriental cruelty in which all the Anglo-Norman Kings indulged. It was his encomium on his rapacious minister, Ralph Flambard (the devouring torch), that to please a master he would brave the vengeance of all mankind; and his exactions were so intolerable, that the blow which deprived William of life was supposed to have been directed by private revenge.

Henry I., the scholar, as flattering historians have named him, when alarmed by the resistance of his Barons, pursued a policy the most profligate and tyrannical ever known in modern times. He employed all the energies of the law and the services of corrupt judges to entrap and convict great landowners, whose forfeited estates on their attainder he bestowed on men of the basest extraction and most abandoned lives. Outlaws themselves for infamous offences, they thus became suddenly possessed of immense wealth, and formed a trusty body of allies against the old Barons of the realm. His dissimulation was proverbial; his violent temper bespoke him the son of William; his dungeons were crowded with victims; and, at his death, there was found his cousin, the Earl of Mortoil, who had long been in the dungeon, and had likewise been deprived of sight. Barrè, a troubadour poet and knight, prisoner of war, was ordered by him, in revenge of a satire he had written, to lose his eyes, notwithstanding the remonstrance of the Earl of Flanders, who was against a proceeding as

cowardly as it was against the laws of chivalry and war. Henry persisted, and the unhappy victim dashed out his brains in a paroxysm of grief and indignation.

The passion of the chase was not merely shown by the Anglo-Norman Princes in laying the country waste to extend their forests; they established a code of forest laws, the most cruel and barbarous of any known among men pretending to the least degree of civilization. All within the forest precincts, and all who dwelt on the borders, were subject to this sanguinary code. It punished the slightest of the innumerable offences which it denounced against the game and the timber, with mutilation, loss of limb, and loss of sight. Henry II. had, at the commencement of his reign, when his crown was doubtful, substituted for these punishments the more merciful penalty of fine and imprisonment; but as his authority became better established he restored the old and savage inflictions. His rapacity yielded to no Prince's since the Conquest; justice was openly bought and sold during his long reign, and instances are not wanting of his taking money from one party to accelerate the decision of a suit, after having been bribed to retard it by the other. That he was the best of William's successors may easily be admitted, without bestowing upon his memory any great praise; but when Hume represents his character as "almost without a blemish;" and adds, that it "extremely resembled that of his grandfather Henry I.," we are naturally led both to reflect on the sanguinary forest laws revived by the one Prince, after he had yielded to the voice of nature in their repeal, and on the corrupt administration of justice, as well as on the barbarous cruelty of the other, in which he has not been surpassed by any sovereign who ever filled the English throne. As for Richard, Hume himself, with all the "childish love for kings" which Mr. Fox so justly imputes to him, has confessed that he was cruel, haughty, tyrannical, and rapacious; and indeed his courage appears to have been his only redeeming quality.

I apprehend, therefore, that the exercise of such tyrannous acts as we thus find to have signalized the Anglo-Norman reigns, and without ever producing resistance from the subject, much less remonstrance from the Parliament, demonstrates the extent of the Royal authority, and the feeble restraints imposed upon it by the Constitution. Provided the King only called his Barons together upon great occasions, to confer with them touching measures of peace and war, or to obtain their assent to new laws, it would seem that he was at liberty to act as he pleased; that the administration of justice afforded no protection to the people; and that the privileges of the Parliament afforded no real check to the caprices, or the cruelty, or even the rapacity of the Prince.

It is quite certain that although in England there was at all times a legislature, of which the King formed only one portion, and though the foundations were thus laid from the most remote antiquity for the free government which was gradually raised upon them, yet as far as regards the actual power of the Sovereign, it was fully as great to all practical purposes, and that the rights and liberties of the people were fully as contracted as in the neighbouring kingdoms of France and Germany. Indeed, the Baronial power, which formed the principal counterpoise in practice to the exercise of the Royal prerogative, was unquestionably more curbed and subdued in England than in the monarchies of the Continent. There can be no creation of national vanity more groundless than the notions which represent our ancestors as enjoying more freedom, and their princes as holding a more limited authority, than was known in the feudal monarchies of the neighbouring nations.

FOUNDATION OF THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND.

THE history of our ancient Constitution, as far as we have now traced it, appears very fully to prove one material proposition respecting its structure. The mere existence of a legislative body independent of the Sovereign, though endowed with the right to share in the making of all laws, and though even admitted to the occasional privilege of being consulted upon extraordinary emergencies, whether of war or of finance, did not of itself secure the freedom of the country, or fix limits to the exercise of the Royal authority.

In order to attain these great objects of all free government, it is absolutely necessary, *first* of all, that the national assembly should be composed of persons entitled to sit in it of their own right, or by some other title than a Royal summons, which may be withheld at pleasure. But it is equally essential, in the *second* place, that it should be summoned regularly, or that the Royal authority should be so circumstanced, the Sovereign so situated, as to make his calling the members together a matter of necessity. *Thirdly*, even if they are secure of meeting, unless their assent be required to all measures of importance, and the Sovereign be held bound by the laws of the realm, no effectual check can be provided to his arbitrary power.

Lastly, unless the members, of one at least of the assemblies, owe their seats in that assembly to the voice of the community at large, or are taken from the body of that community, and so have the same interest with their fellows, the security of the public interests and liberties must be altogether imperfect. The Crown may be limited in its power; the Parliament may be clothed with important privileges; many of the greatest abuses may be prevented; considerable assurances may be obtained of the general good being the guide of the government in its administration; but nothing can prevent the machine from working with a bias towards the interests of particular classes in the community, those classes composing the assembly; because the deliberations of that body must lean towards the interests of those who form its members.

It is necessary to keep these fundamental principles constantly in view while considering the ancient structure of the English Government, else we shall surely be deceived by the mere name of a Parliament, and fancy that because there was always in England a National Council, there was always a free Constitution. There cannot be a greater mistake. When William laid waste Hampshire for a hunting ground, Yorkshire and Durham for a security to his conquests —when his successors each in his turn imitated his example as far as their pleasures were concerned— when they imprisoned in English or in Norman dungeons those grandees who had offended them, and put out their eyes like Persian or Egyptian Sultans— when they proclaimed the life of a man and of a stag of equal value, and mutilated the peasant who presumed to kill the deer or the hare that had trespassed on his corn-fields—those tyrants, thus well earning the character given by the Chroniclers, "that while the rich moaned and the poor murmured, all must follow the King's will who would have either lands or goods,"—yet could none of them make any law without calling together a Parliament in order to obtain the assent of the Prelates and the Barons. No more clear proof surely needs be given of their thoughtless folly who, in the zeal of party or the overflowing of national vanity, scruple not to affirm that the English have in all ages enjoyed a free, because a Parliamentary, Constitution.

The four great requisites of a real and effectual Parliamentary government—independent right of the members to sit, security for meeting regularly, necessity of being consulted, and general representation— were only obtained by our ancestors in the long course of ages, during which the Constitution became gradually more and more perfect. The foundations of the whole, however, were laid at a very early period, when the Barons came in conflict with the violence of the King, and when they found that the most effectual way of resisting his encroachments and securing their own rights, was not by making war upon him, but by securing the calling them to the national assembly, of which they formed the most important part as regarded influence in the country, although less important than the clergy in point of personal weight and authority. This first step was made in the reign of John, and others of almost equal importance were at the same time partially made.

The immediate cause of the quarrel between John and his Barons is extremely immaterial. From the beginning of his reign he had fallen into general contempt, by the feeble conduct which lost Normandy to the Crown; and the Barons resisted all his attempts to make them aid him in recovering it. For their disaffection he had rapaciously levied large sums, as we have seen, the seventh, it is said, of their personal property, under pretence of punishing their misconduct. The cruel murder of his nephew, Prince Arthur, impressed men's minds with the greatest abhorrence of him; and his general conduct was that of a profligate, a cowardly, and a bloodthirsty tyrant. An association of the Barons was formed, and they held a Council at St. Alban's in 1214, under the Justiciary, when, without the King's concurrence, they republished the Charter of Henry I., and threatened the King's officers with death if they in any way exceeded the bounds of their lawful authority. A second Council was soon after held by them at St. Paul's, in London, and an oath taken to stand by one another with their lives and fortunes until redress should be obtained. After fruitless attempts to divide their league, John was next summer compelled to yield their demands, by granting both the general or Great Charter and that of the Forest, hardly of less practical importance than the former.

The Barons had found it necessary, in carrying on their long struggle against the tyrant, to take measures for conciliating the people, and securing their support in case matters were pushed to the extremity of a civil war. Hence the same concessions which they demanded from the King to his vassals, they themselves made on their parts to their own; and the feudal oppressions were thus mitigated both to themselves as tenants in chief of the Crown, and to their sub-tenants. The King and the other feudal lords were restricted in their demands of aid from their vassals to the three cases of knighting his eldest son, marrying his eldest daughter, and ransoming his person if taken in war; all other aids must have

the consent of Parliament. The King's ministers were deprived of all the jurisdiction by which they had previously levied fines for offences arbitrarily in order to fill the Royal coffers. His officers were no longer permitted to take provisions for his use on his progresses through the country, termed *purveyance*. Justice was declared to be no longer within the King's breast to deny, or delay, or sell it to the highest bidder, as Henry II. had so shamelessly done. Judges were henceforth to go the circuit all over the country at stated times. It was expressly provided that no free man should be imprisoned, or his goods seized, unless upon conviction by a jury of his peers, according to the law of the land.

But the most important provision in the Great Charter, as regards the form of the government, related to the summoning of Parliament. The clause which prohibited the raising of aids without the consent of a Council, required it to be composed of Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Earls, and greater Barons, all of whom were to be summoned individually by the King's writ; and of the other tenants *in capite* of the Crown, who were to be summoned in the mass by the sheriffs of counties. The notice of forty days was to be given by them, and the subject-matter of their deliberations was to be stated in the summons. It is remarkable that this important clause formed no part of the original demand of the Barons; and that it was omitted in the charter subsequently granted by Henry III. There seems reasonable ground for suspecting that the Barons little valued this provision; they were obliged to attend the King's court as a burden incident to their feudal tenure; and the principal object in the clause was to declare that those who neglected to attend should, if the Parliament were duly summoned, be bound, though absent, by the determinations of those who were present at any council. It must be further observed that this provision refers exclusively to one species of council, that which should be held for the granting of an aid or supply to the Crown. But, on the other hand, the insertion of the provision sufficiently proves the greater attention which was now paid to the subject of taxation. We have seen in the last Chapter how irregularly the power of levying money was exercised, and how seldom the Norman Princes resorted to Parliament for their extraordinary supplies. The loss of many landed possessions, especially during the civil wars of Stephen and Maude, and the loss by John of the Norman dominions, had now so far impoverished the Crown that recourse was more frequently had than formerly to the levying of extraordinary aids; and hence the care taken to make this provision in the Charter.

It is a further and important proof of the progress which the towns and ports had made in wealth, that their privileges and liberties are guaranteed by a specific clause; so that the power hitherto exercised of levying tolls and customs upon the markets and upon imports, could no longer be lawfully used by the King.

The Forest Charter declared that all the land taken in to form parts of Royal forests, since John's accession, should be thrown open; and that twelve Knights should be chosen in each county court to inquire into forest abuses, and abolish all illegal customs which had been introduced, as well as to examine the conduct of the sheriffs and inferior officers of the Crown.

In order to secure the execution of the Great Charter, an extraordinary step was taken. Not only the Tower of London was delivered into the hands of the Barons for two months; but twenty-five of their number were chosen, without any limitation of time, as conservators of the Privileges of the Realm, authorized, upon a complaint made, to admonish the King, and empowered, if redress were refused, to levy war against him. All persons were required to swear obedience to them, and, in fact, the executive power was entrusted to their hands. Nothing can more clearly show that the whole proceeding was of a revolutionary character; and accordingly, John no sooner saw the Barons disperse than he collected his troops, ravaged the whole country, and finding no resistance from the League, would have entirely effaced all recollection of his submission at Runnimede, had not the Barons, unable to cope with him, called in Louis, the French King's son, and delivered over the crown to him, in the defence of which he was engaged when the death of John and the able administration of the Regent Pembroke enabled the Barons to defeat him, and to restore the independence of the kingdom.

The first step taken by the Regent, when preparing for this important operation, was to assemble a Great Council or Parliament, which was attended by all the Prelates and Abbots, some Barons, and many Knights. The Great Charter was renewed and confirmed, with some omissions; among others, that of the clause authorizing resistance, that respecting the summons to Parliament, and that respecting the forest abuses. But those provisions were expressly reserved for further consideration in a full assembly. Another confirmation of the Charter was given soon after. Many years later Henry called a Parliament to grant him an aid, which was at first refused, but afterwards given, on the ground of a threatened invasion from France. The assembly granted a fifteenth of personal property, but made the ratification of both the Charters an express

condition of the grant. Notwithstanding the two former confirmations, little effect was given to the provisions of those Charters by the King's officers. They were since renewed no less than five-and-thirty times in the reign of the Plantagenet Kings down to Henry VI., and always in the same form which they assumed in the 9th of Henry III. This Prince was ever in want of money, and he confirmed the two Charters in all six times; once or twice he was compelled to swear that he would observe them religiously.

The misfortunes which afterwards befell him are well known. In 1258 a Parliament called by him at Westminster was attended by the Barons, who assembled in armour; and, requiring redress of their grievances, compelled him to deliver over the greater part of the Royal prerogatives to a commission of lay and clerical peers, who should be named in a Parliament speedily to be holden at Oxford. This, which is known by the name of the "*Mad Parliament*," virtually deposed the King, vested the representation in twelve persons, and appointed Parliaments to be held three times every year. The victory of Simon de Montford at the battle of Lincoln led to his usurping the royal authority; and in 1264 he assembled such a Parliament as he considered would be favourable to his views. The writs of summons ran not only to Prelates, Abbots, and Barons, such being selected as were known to favour him; but four Knights were called, to be elected in the court of each county, and two deputies from each city and borough town. The lesser Barons and free tenants had in all probability for some time before been in the practice of sending two or four of their own number to attend the Council, and save the whole freeholders the trouble and expense of attendance; but it seems certain that this was the first occasion on which the towns sent representatives. Although the origin of our burgh representation seems thus to be fixed, we are altogether in the dark as to the mode in which the representatives were chosen. The freeholders chose their representatives at the county court; we know not how the townfolk chose theirs.

It appears that during the whole of Edward I.'s reign, till towards the latter end, though the cities and towns were summoned, yet their members did not attend regularly unless when the question of taxes upon those places arose. This seems to be the result of the best examination which I have been able to give the Statutes and the Writs. The towns which had the earliest writ of summons were those in all probability of the Royal demesne, they being in the nature of tenants in chief of the Crown.

The most important step which was made in those times towards the establishment of a Parliamentary constitution was the concession extorted from Edward I. towards the close of his reign. We have seen that the clause in King John's Great Charter, forbidding the Crown to levy any aid not granted by Parliament, was immediately afterwards struck out of the confirmations granted in Henry III.'s time; and greater oppressions than ever were practised in levying taxes upon the people. The revenues of the Crown from land were much diminished; the numbers of men liable to military service had also greatly decreased from the negligence of the mustering officers; and the turbulence of the feudal militia rendering the sovereign unwilling to employ them, he had recourse to hiring mercenaries, or bargaining with the Barons for paid forces. A great necessity for supplies was thus experienced by Edward in the course of the constant wars which he waged in Wales, in Scotland, and in France. To obtain these supplies he had frequent recourse to Parliament. In the first thirty-four years of his reign he had twelve times assembled that body for this purpose, and obtained twenty-one grants from the laity and five from the clergy. The former amounted in all to nearly the whole personal property in the kingdom; the latter did not fall much short of a whole year's income of the Church. Yet still his wants were pressing, and he had recourse to the most violent means for supplying them as often as the Parliament refused the aid which he required. He occasionally levied tallages, or a per centage, on all personal property, of his own authority. All his predecessors had maintained their right to do so. John had sent itinerant justices round the counties for the purpose of swearing the bailiffs of all the landowners to the amount of their goods and rents. Henry III. had caused the same inquisition to be performed by four knights in each county, these commissioners being chosen by the justices. They swore each person to the amount of his own, and the personal property of his two next neighbours; and a jury of twelve men was to decide if the amount thus given in was disputed. Edward likewise sent out commissioners round the country to ascertain and levy the amount of tallage, as well that granted by Parliament as that which he imposed, more rarely, of his own authority; and the oppression and corruption of these officers was a cruel grievance to the people. But when he found a difficulty with the Parliament he did not confine himself to exacting tallage after the manner of his predecessors; his expeditions made other supplies necessary; and, fortunately for the liberties of the country, he had recourse to means which proved still more vexatious, till the evil worked its own cure. He raised, arbitrarily,

the duties on exported wool, and forced the merchants to give him a loan equal to the whole value of the quantity shipped by them; and he more than once seized all their wool and hides, and sold them for his own use. He equally assailed the landowners, seizing their live stock, and issuing orders to the sheriffs to collect both provisions and grain for his army.

A spirit of resistance was excited by these violent encroachments, unequalled even in the worst times of his predecessors; and the Barons, under Bohun and Bigod, so far intimidated the officers as to stop the purveyances which the King had ordered. Edward was alarmed by the proceedings of the two earls, made his peace with the clergy, gained over the citizens of London by a flattering speech, and sailed for the Continent. But he soon ordered a large levy to be made on the clergy, and thus united them with the people in support of the earls. The council appointed to assist the Prince of Wales in the regency took the same course; and Edward was compelled most reluctantly to grant a solemn confirmation of the two Charters, with this important addition, that no aid or tallage should thenceforth be raised unless by the assent of Parliament—that is, of the Prelates, Barons, Knights, and Burgesses of the realm; that no seizure of wool, hides, or other goods should be made by the Crown, nor any toll taken upon them; that all customs and penalties contrary to the Charter and to this additional article should be void; that the Charter so amended should be read twice a year in all cathedrals; and that all persons acting against it should be excommunicated.

Edward endeavoured soon after to evade the force of the obligation thus solemnly contracted; and added a clause, saving all the Crown's rights. This, when proclaimed, excited so great a clamour in the city of London, that he again became alarmed, and gave his unqualified retraction of the clause. The year after, 1300, complaint being made in Parliament that the Charters remained unexecuted, he was obliged to grant an additional article, that the Charter should be read four times a year in all the sheriffs' courts, and that three knights in each county should be chosen by the freeholders, with power from the King, to punish summarily all offences not otherwise provided for against the Charters. In the course of two or three years, however, he openly violated the new law thus made, levying tallage and poll-tax without resistance. He also appealed to the Pope to be absolved from the obligations which he had contracted; but though he obtained a Rescript declaring all his concessions void; yet, as with its artful statement of the grounds of the declaration, their having been contrary to the rights of the Crown, it added a clause securing to the subjects their ancient rights, he never ventured to use it; so that at his death, two years after, he left the famous statute prohibiting all taxation without the consent of Parliament, as the established law of the land.

Although we should admit that the provisions in the Charter, thus confirmed for the tenth time, and the important additions made to it, were but imperfectly kept, that they were so often violated as to require constant renewals with repeated pledges, no less, indeed, than fifteen times in the next reign but one, it is nevertheless certain that a prodigious advantage was gained to Constitutional Government and popular rights by the nation having the text of a treaty to cite, the provisions of a law solemnly made in writing and universally known, to rely upon in their disputes with the Crown. The Prince who now levied money without the consent of Parliament, or who assembled a few dependent Barons and Burgesses instead of the whole Lords and Commons, acted avowedly and openly an illegal part, and plainly violated a known, established, and fundamental law of the land. It might depend upon the temper of his subjects at the moment, upon the force at his command, upon his success in courting and gaining one class of men to side with him against the rest, upon the courage and patriotism of the Parliamentary and popular leaders, above all, upon his own personal endowments, and his credit with the country for an able and successful administration of its affairs, whether he should be suffered to break the law with impunity, —whether he had to dread resistance to his oppressive acts; and consequently it would naturally depend on all these circumstances whether or not he should venture upon so unlawful a course. But there can be no doubt that he was sure to be often restrained in making the attempt, sometimes opposed when he made it, and occasionally punished when he ventured so far. The most important part of the new law of Edward was the renewal of the provisions originally inserted nearly a century before, and immediately afterwards left out, with the more precise recognition of the power of Parliament, and the important addition of the County and Burgh representation. From this period we may truly say that the Constitution of Parliament, as now established, had its origin; and however that body may have occasionally had to struggle for its privileges, how often soever it may have submitted unworthily to oppression, how little soever it may have shown a determination to resist cruelty and injustice, and even a disposition to become the accomplice in such acts, we must allow that, generally speaking, it has, ever

since the end of the thirteenth century, formed a substantive and effective part of the Constitution, and that the monarchy then assumed the mixed form which it now wears. The great outline was then drawn; the details, and shades, and tints have since been filled in.

The English nation ought piously to hold in veneration the memory of those gallant and virtuous men who thus laid the foundations of a Constitution to which we are so justly attached. The conduct of the Barons in John's reign is indeed above all praise, because it was marked by as much moderation and wisdom as firmness of purpose and contempt of personal danger. They had no sooner held their Council at St. Albans, and proclaimed the Charter of Henry I., than the tyrant, landing with his foreign troops, marched to lay their estates under military execution, and take signal vengeance on their persons. Cardinal Langton, the Primate, who, though forced on the kingdom by papal domination, had ever shown himself a true patriot, stayed his progress by his peremptory remonstrances, and by his threat of excommunicating all who should engage in such a warfare, while the legal course of bringing offenders to trial was open to the Crown. He afterwards encouraged the Barons, at the Council of St. Paul's, to insist on Henry's Charter, and excited them by his persuasive eloquence to take the famous oath, which he solemnly administered to them, that they would die sooner than depart from this demand. He had already compelled John to promise the same Charter, then termed the Confessor's Laws, as the condition of reversing his excommunication. Once more, in the assembly of Bury St. Edmund's, he influenced them by his eloquence, and they took their oath at the altar, to make endless war on the King until he granted their demands. Nay, when John, in order to gain over the clergy as a last expedient, granted them a charter, abandoning all right of interfering with the choice of Bishops, and declaring that their election, though not confirmed by him, should still be valid, promising, moreover, to lead an army to Palestine, and taking the cross himself as a pledge of his pious resolution, the Primate was so little to be moved from his principles, or duped by such tricks, that he adhered to the party of the Barons throughout, only so far gained by the King as to make himself the bearer of propositions for their consideration; and, when the Pope had commanded him to yield, he positively refused to excommunicate them, according to the papal threats, but threatened to excommunicate John's foreign troops unless they were instantly disbanded.

But as the Pope's whole conduct in this important affair was wholly unjustifiable, and indeed despicable, and as his successor in Edward's time had no share in the resistance offered by the Barons, the Romish advocates are fain to claim for their Church a share, not only in the proceedings which extorted the Great Charter from John, but also in those which rendered it effectual to its purpose under Edward. Accordingly, Dr. Lingard, while he places Langton on a level with the Barons of Runnimede, pronounces Archbishop Winchelsey the author, with the two earls, Norfolk and Hereford, of the great change in 1297. Nothing can be more absurd. He wholly overlooks Langton's great praise, of having alike opposed the encroachments of Rome and of the domestic tyrant, of having faced the indignation of the Vatican, refused to execute its menaces, and used its thunder against John and his foreign mercenaries—of having shown so noble a disregard of his order and its interests, that the bribe of the January charter fell as powerless before him as the threats both of Innocent and his vassal. Winchelsey, on the contrary, was ever in league with Boniface VIII., obtained from him the bull against lay encroachments, took up his position in defence of the Church revenues behind that bulwark, was melted by Edward's speech and tears at Westminster, as much as the mere mob, to whom the crafty prince appealed against his Barons, and was evidently disarmed by the order immediately after issued in imitation of John's early Charter, so utterly scorned by Langton, to protect the clergy in the enjoyment of all their possessions; and Edward immediately took him into favour, appointing him one of the young Prince's tutors and Council as Regent in his absence. His conduct in this office has been extolled. But to what did it amount? On the Barons refusing to attend the Council's summons to Parliament unless the gates of London were given up to their keeping, Winchelsey advised that this requisition should be complied with, clearly against his duty as the Regent's chief councillor. He appears throughout to have acted an interested part, prompted solely by a regard for the interests of his order; and the whole merit of the great change which we have been contemplating belongs to the Barons, the merchants, and their leaders, Bohun of Hereford, and Bigod of Norfolk. The clergy all behaved like their Primate. Edward's concessions won them over to his side, and they left the Barons and the people. On his sailing he, forgetting these concessions, ordered a heavy tallage to be levied upon their personal property; straightway they left him, and once more took part with the country.

While Edward has justly obtained the highest

praise from lawyers for the great improvements which he introduced into our jurisprudence, we may remark that the two great changes which he made in the law were pointed in directions not merely different, but diametrically opposite. The power of the Barons and of all landed proprietors was exceedingly increased by the famous statute *de Donis*, which allowed them to entail their real property, and thus to sustain the landed aristocracy. But the restraints upon alienations to the Church by the laws of mortmain, tended exceedingly to restrain the power of the spiritual Barons, though they might also give some additional protection to the lay aristocracy.

The conquests of Edward had no sensible tendency to increase the power of the Crown. Scotland was a source of expense and of weakness. Wales was still a greater diversion to his forces, without producing the least return either in men or money. On the Continent he was generally unsuccessful, and he found the expense and defence of his dominions there fully equal to any benefit they ever yielded him.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND UNDER THE PLANTAGENETS.

THE more regular establishment of the Parliament, and the more full recognition of its privileges, was plainly to be seen in the events of the next reign. Edward, on his death-bed, had extorted a promise from his son that he would never allow his unpopular favourite, Piers Gaveston, to return from banishment without the Parliament's leave. That body made the favourite's return without their assent the ground of hostile proceedings against him, and his perpetual exile was made one of the conditions annexed to their first grant of a subsidy to Edward II. The annexing as a condition the redress of public grievances was now the course taken by them as a natural consequence of their acknowledged power to give or to withhold supplies. But a short time, however, elapsed before all regular and constitutional government was at an end, the Barons having, by an armed demonstration compelled the King to allow the appointment of a Commission, called the *Ordinances*, consisting of Prelates and Barons empowered to prepare new Ordinances for the redress of grievances. Their proceedings, agreed to by the King in Parliament, nearly resembled those of the Mad Parliament in Henry III.'s reign; as their authority was plainly modelled upon that of the Committee of Barons then appointed. Some of their Ordinances were valuable improvements, especially that regulating the choice of sheriffs; abolishing all but the ancient purveyances, and repealing the new and oppressive taxes on wool and other merchandise. One clearly resembled the Mad Parliament's law, that three Parliaments should be held yearly. The Ordinances required "one to be held each year, or oftener if need be." Another also resembled the former precedent; for it transferred the whole functions of the Crown to the Parliament. The King was bound to obtain the consent of the Barons before he could either levy war or quit the realm; and the Regent, in his absence, was to be chosen by the Parliament, whose advice and consent was also made necessary to the appointment of all the great officers of State and governors of the foreign possessions of the Crown.

The other transactions of Edward II.'s reign are immaterial to our present purpose; but throughout the whole of it there prevailed the assumption that no matter of great importance could be transacted without the presence, interference, and sanction of Parliament. Nor is there any part of the Constitution practically of more importance than the recognition of this principle. The King's deposition was effected by a Parliament which the Queen and her paramour, Mortimer, summoned at Westminster, in the name of the King, by means of the Prince whom the Prelates and Barons in their interest had named guardian of the realm, or Regent. The Parliament also passed an act of indemnity for all offences committed during the revolutionary crisis, and appointed a Council of Regency, the young sovereign being only fifteen years of age.

The weakness of the Crown in the second Edward's reign had prevented all violent measures for raising supplies by the Royal authority alone. But his son, Edward III., whose wars occasioned a great increase of expenditure, was frequently induced to exert the prerogative which, like his grandfather, he always asserted, maintaining that the famous statute of 1297 had not validly abridged it. He contended that he had the right to impose tallage "in cases of public emergency, and for reasonable cause;" nor would he even so far yield to the representations of the Commons as to declare such imposts illegal, always adding a saving clause for these extraordinary occasions. He several times, in defiance of the statute "*De Tallagio non Concedendo*," levied a tallage of his mere authority. He did so in 1338, at the beginning of the war which led to his great naval victory of Blakensberg; and moreover had recourse to forced loans, and to seizures of all the tin and wool of the year, the *Maletolte* of his grandfather. Nevertheless, the war was extremely popular with both Lords and Commons; both urged

him to prosecute it, and were satisfied with his promises that the *Maletolte* should cease in two years, to which effect a statute was made. In 1342, however, he was allowed to levy it for three years longer, by the assent of the Lords and a Council of Merchants, whom he had irregularly summoned, instead of assembling the Commons. The Parliament suffered this on express condition that no such maletolte should ever after be imposed. For some years he found that the grants of Parliament were a more convenient resource, and to these he confined himself. He yearly assembled his Parliament, and obtained grants for the prosecution of the war, illustrated as it was by the great victories of Crecy in 1346, and Poitiers in 1356, the capture of Calais in 1347, and the great sea-fight of 1350 in the Channel. The consequence of this constant recourse to Parliament was, that taxation became in some sort regulated upon a system; and sometimes when the King had exceeded his lawful authority and imposed a tax, the Parliament would, after remonstrance, themselves grant the same duty, evidently for the purpose of preventing an illegal precedent, and wisely preserving the bulk of their constitutional privileges. On one occasion, in 1346, when he had issued an ordinance that all landowners should furnish knights and archers in proportion to their rental, and each burgh so much money, the Commons remonstrated; when he stated the necessities of the war and the assent of the Lords. This, however, did not satisfy the Commons; and he promised that it should never be drawn into a precedent. Several further remonstrances followed, and an Act was passed, that for the future all such ordinances should be deemed contrary to the liberties of the realm; and further, that no petition of the clergy should be granted without the Council certifying that it contained nothing against the rights of the Lords and Commons. To all this the King assented; but when the Parliament further insisted that no statute should be made at the petition of the clergy without the consent of the Lords and Commons, he gave their request a civil refusal.

In raising men for the public service, the King, during the early reigns of the Plantagenets, appears to have been under less restraint than in raising money. This greater latitude arose from two causes: the pretext of danger to the State was always at hand —and the great bulk of the men levied were of the common people, whose interests were little regarded by the Barons, Knights, and traders that composed the Parliament. Hence we can trace hardly any limits to the King's authority in calling out his subjects on emergencies. In the Anglo-Saxon times, and even under the Anglo-Norman Princes, the reliance of the Crown was entirely upon the feudal services of the vassals with their sub-tenants; and it was a force much better calculated for hôme defence than for the operations of foreign war, because it only served for a limited time, and was seldom in the field. The number of men which the land was bound to furnish had so exceedingly decreased, from the changes in the distribution of property, and from the neglect of the public servants who had charge of the musters and arrays, that they were supposed to have been ten times more numerous in the twelfth than in the thirteenth century; and the main reliance of the Edwards was upon contracts, for men properly equipped, made with the Barons at the hire of enormous sums, as much as one shilling and sixpence a day for a mounted archer (equal to thirty shillings of our money); and upon infantry raised by mere Royal authority in the counties. It was indeed understood that no man could be compelled to leave his county unless in case of invasion; but pretexts were never wanting of such threatened dangers; and it was often urged that the interest of the people was rather to fight at a distance than have their homes ravaged by the war. Not only fighting men were thus pressed into the military service of the Crown, and vessels to carry troops abroad, sometimes all the shipping to be found in any of the ports, with as many seamen as were wanted to man them; but workmen and artificers were swept away in great numbers, and exposed to the perils of war. Thus near 400 of these were carried over to the siege of Calais in 1348. As many as 1,100 vessels were seized in this manner and used by Edward III. before the battle of Blakensberg. When, in 1346, before Crecy, he issued the ordinance which has been mentioned above, the Commons complained of the practice as regarded levies of men, inasmuch as the landowners were affected by that proceeding, and not merely the peasants. An Act was in consequence passed forbidding the carrying of any man out of his county in future, excepting in the case of actual invasion.

Such was the struggle always maintained in those times between the Crown and the Parliament—that is, between the Sovereign and the great and little Barons and the mercantile classes, then first rising into importance. There were many infractions of the laws made to protect the subject, many invasions of the Constitution as it was allowed to stand upon the provisions of the Charters, and the statutes confirming and extending those Charters. But the progress was steadily making towards a more exact observance of the law, a more secure enjoyment of popular rights, and a more strict limitation of the Royal authority. The reign of Edward III. was distinguished, as we

have seen, by an additional statutory declaration of those liberties and those restraints, both as regarded taxing and the levying of troops—if indeed the latter enactment be not rather to be regarded as a new chapter added to the rights of the people and the limitation of the King's power. Another statute in his reign regulated and defined the right or abuse of purveyance—that is, the exaction of provisions on the Royal journeys. A third, made in 1351, by what has been in consequence called the Blessed Parliament, abolished the fanciful heads of the old treason law, and confined that offence within known and narrow bounds, which it has, in the further progress of legislation, never materially exceeded, unless for short periods of time.

Hitherto, in tracing all the branches of the Constitutional progress in these three reigns, we have been upon well-known ground; but if we proceed further, and inquire into the constitution of Parliament, as regards the mode of its election, and the course of its proceedings, we are involved in extraordinary difficulties. The ancient authorities, for the reasons already stated, are either silent, or give us very meagre information on those most important matters; and we know little more for certain than the result, without being able to ascertain the steps by which it was attained. Thus, though we know that the whole Freeholders, first the tenants *in capite*, and afterwards, but at a period unknown, also the sub-tenants of the Crown, chose the Knights of the shire, we are little able to tell how the Burgesses were elected. The probability is, that all the Burghers in each town had a voice; but we cannot say what regulated the issuing of the writs to the different towns, and whether this depended on the Royal will, or on that of the sheriff, or on the right of some towns to send representatives, and of others to be excused from the burden, as it was then considered, in consequence of the obligation to pay the members wages during the session. So we are left in some doubt as to the right of the Barons. All Prelates had seats in Parliament by virtue of their episcopal baronies; and all who held lands by tenure of barony had a right to sit. But how these were distinguished from the lesser Barons, the freeholders, and how far the King could withhold the writ, as well as how he was to distinguish the classes of Barons, we are imperfectly informed; only we may affirm that a large discretion in this respect appears to have rested in the Crown.—Again, mitred Abbots had seats at first as well as Bishops; and their right to sit only ceased upon the dissolution of the monasteries in Henry VIII.'s reign.

Besides Barons, lay and clerical, the Judges and Privy Councillors were also summoned to Parliament, and formed part of the upper or Lords' house when this was separated from the lower. They at first sat and voted as well as attended; but at what period they ceased to be component parts of the Lords' house, and began to attend as assistants only (which the Judges do still), we are unable to say.

The number of the County members was generally two from each shire; but in the 11 Edward I. four were chosen. The Burghs were, about the same period, not more than twenty, each of which chose two members. In the reign of Edward III. the Burghs amounted to one hundred and twenty, and continued of this number till Elizabeth's time.

The precise period at which the Commons first sat apart from the Lords is equally unknown; indeed, it is perhaps less known than any part of the Parliamentary history. It can hardly be supposed that the different orders ever sat together after the Burghs sent members. At first the Knights sat, in all probability, with the Barons, and afterwards with the Commons. That in early times the separation of the orders, and even of different members of the same order, was frequent, there remains clear proof. In 1282 the members for towns north and south of Trent met in different parts of the kingdom, and each came to separate resolutions as to supply. In 1360 the Commons met in as many as five different places. Nothing can more clearly show that the purpose in summoning the Commons was to obtain grants from them of supply. The clergy met in Convocation, and taxed themselves in their separate character. The Prelates who attended Parliament formed an entirely different body from that properly representing the Church; they sat as holding their lands and their bishoprics generally by the tenure of barony, and in this respect were exactly on the same footing with the lay Barons.

The Commons only by slow degrees obtained a full equality with the Lords; they were admitted gradually to an equal voice upon the greater concerns of the State. All questions respecting the succession to the Crown, the guardianship of the infant Sovereign, the Royal marriages, treaties concerning the foreign possessions of the realm—all questions, indeed, that did not immediately concern the imposing of taxes or regulation of trade—appear to have been confined to the cognizance of the Lords. But the Commons occasionally took the opportunity of a difficult crisis to interfere, at first only with their assent, and in support of the prevailing party in the Lords, generally by an almost unanimous resolution; and in the time of the first Plantagenets there are few instances of

even this interference. The ordinary course of the Crown was to consult the different orders upon different matters; and no one order was held entitled to have its assent asked as necessary to the passing of any bill that did not affect its separate interests. The whole were only understood to be consulted of necessity on matters affecting the whole, and the Commons hardly ever upon the higher affairs of State. Thus the Lords were entitled to refuse their assent to bills affecting the Peerage or Prelacy, and generally on the *ardua regni*, and the Burgesses on matters affecting trade. But the Commons were not entitled to be heard on measures of the former description, or the Peers on those of the latter. Thus in Edward III.'s time a duty of 2*s.* tonnage on foreign wines, and 6*d.* in the pound on goods imported, was granted by the Citizens and Burgesses only, the consent of the Lords not being held necessary, as they were not supposed to be interested in the matter. Edward attempted once or twice to carry this notion much further, defending his imposition of duties on foreign merchandise upon the pretext that it was paid by foreigners, and did not affect his English subjects. But the Parliament remonstrated, and generally obtained his consent to abstain from such impositions.

Another course was more than once resorted to by him upon the same principle. He would assemble one class, as the foreign merchants in London, and ask an increase of the duties imposed by Parliament, in consideration of granting them certain commercial privileges. They agreed; and he then issued writs to all the towns, that he might meet the members from each, and offer them the same privileges on the same conditions. They met in an irregular kind of Parliament, and very wisely refused his offer. Another proceeding of his was liable to less objection, though it would at this day be deemed very irregular. He would assemble the Lords, and obtain their approval of some measures, or the Lords and Knights of the Shire, or Deputies from the Merchants, and thus fortified would hold a Parliament and propose the bill to them. But it was also usual to hold assemblies of the Lords apart from the Commons, and these were termed Councils rather than Parliaments. If any of the Commons attended, they were there only in their capacity of great officers of State or Privy Councillors; and it could but rarely happen that these offices were held by any but the peers, lay or ecclesiastical.

The time of holding Parliaments was, as we have seen, early the subject of legislative enactment. In Henry III.'s reign, in Edward I.'s, and in Edward II.'s, provision was made that Parliament should be holden yearly at the least. In Edward III.'s time a new Act was passed, requiring a Parliament to be held every year.

When the Parliament met, there was generally an adjournment to give the members time to arrive. The Chancellor then explained the King's reason for assembling them, and directed each order to go to its own chamber. Two committees were then appointed of what was called *Triers*—that is, to examine and decide on petitions. The Lords chiefly occupied themselves with such subjects, administering justice in the last resort, deciding cases when the Judges differed, or thought they had no authority, and granting relief generally on the application of parties. The number of petitions presented is said to have been enormous under the first Plantagenet Princes after Magna Charta. It is related that a practice grew up of lawyers getting counties to elect them, and then surreptitiously intruding the claims of their clients into Petitions or Bills of the Commons, which thus appeared to back those claims before the Lords. This led to the statute prohibiting lawyers from being chosen knights of the shire. There was little chance of the merchants and others in burghs returning them.

All propositions in either House took the form of Petitions to the King for his order, assent, or edict, which thus had the force of law; and at the close of each Session the Clerks of the Chancery reduced the whole to the form of Statutes, which were then sent to the Judges for their guidance, and to the Sheriffs of counties for general publication. But it thus often happened that the matters in the bills underwent great alteration; that the King caused the redress which the Parliament had sought, and which he had promised them, to be omitted in the statute; and that the clerks themselves, from carelessness, ignorance, or sinister motives, changed the terms of the law. It also constantly happened that as soon as the supplies were granted, Parliament was dismissed by prorogation; the promised redress was forgotten; and the King's officers and others, whom the Acts commanded to do certain things, entirely disregarded the command. Indeed, the King even claimed a right to alter in his Privy Council the provisions of the Acts that had been passed during the session. These abuses, which never could at any time have been the law, were complained of, and regulations were made to prevent them in future. The Commons required that all enactments should be put into their final shape before the Parliament was prorogued; and in 1354 a statute was made strictly forbidding any alteration whatever of an Act after it had been made, without the consent of both Houses. It was not so easy to compel the strict execution of the laws made, and

we meet with constant complaints of their being inoperative.

It is remarkable how the careless manner of preparing Acts of Parliament has been handed down even to our day. It is a remnant of the "olden time," and of the practice of leaving everything to the clerks, that there is at this day so very imperfect a security against careless or wilful error, or alteration in the most important of all records—that of the statutes of the realm. There is no true record, no *constat* of even bills being read as often as the law of Parliament requires, nothing except a mere note of the clerks of the Houses; and when an alteration is made in a bill by one House, it is made on an unsigned and wholly unauthenticated slip of paper. A serious irregularity lately arose in this way, and gave rise to much discussion.

The imperfect provision made in the old Acts for carrying into effect the avowed intention of the legislature is well known. Thus when an aid, or a tallage, or a subsidy was granted, the machinery for raising it was left undescribed. A tallage was in fact a property-tax, and the Act granting it gave in a few lines what it takes now a hundred pages to describe. The whole manner of levying the money (a thing fully as important to the subject as the amount to be levied) was left in the King's discretion. The greatest oppression having been suffered in Edward II.'s time from his collectors, Edward III. fell upon an expedient which gave very great satisfaction to all, though it was certainly an unauthorized act of legislation in itself: he appointed commissioners to compound with each county and each town for the amount which they should pay towards the tallage or subsidy that had been granted in general terms by the Parliament.

When the King dismissed, prorogued, or dissolved the Parliament (and it seldom sat more than one session), a committee was sometimes appointed of the Lords to sit during the recess, for the purpose of finishing the judicial or administrative business which had proved too bulky to be despatched during the session, the time being always very short during which Parliament was kept together. Abuses arose not of this practice, the committee assuming powers of a legislative kind; and another practice of a far worse nature was resorted to in troublous times, of which we have seen already two instances under Henry III. and Edward II., that of delivering over the Prerogative of the Crown and the legislative power of Parliament to a select committee, always composed, like the Vacation Committee, of Lords only.

The constitution of Parliament appears to have undergone little or no alteration from the time of Edward III.; but its functions became gradually better defined. The authority of the Commons was pretty regularly on the increase; and the privileges of its members became more fully secured. In the turbulent reign of Richard II. the Lords alone gave absolute power to the Duke of Gloster during the King's minority. But the Commons carefully looked after the public expenditure, required to have the inspection of the accounts, insisted on the supplies being enrolled, in order that the expenditure might be better examined, and only granted a subsidy on finding that everything had been regularly carried on. This was in 1378, and next year the King offered to produce all accounts; when the Lords chose a committee of their number to examine even his household expenditure. The Parliament having now required that the ministers of State should be chosen with their consent, and having imposed a poll-tax, the well-known insurrection of the common people under Wat Tyler broke out; and the sufferings of the villeins or serfs, the bulk of the people, excited such fury that the King granted a charter of emancipation to appease it. The aristocracy immediately revoked this grant. The Commons now required, for the first time, the removal of one obnoxious minister,—Suffolk, the Chancellor: the King said he would not at their desire displace the meanest scullion in his kitchen. He was, however, forced to yield; and Suffolk was at first dismissed, then impeached. The Lords now appear to have usurped the powers of the Government, which they handed over to a committee of their number, creatures of Gloster, with legislative as well as executive authority, as in Henry III. and Edward II.'s time. This happened in 1386, and the next Parliament was devoted to that ambitious Prince. The Commons, however, suddenly took part with the King, protected him in his resumption of the Royal authority, and even after his murder of Gloster, helped him to pass the statute of Provisors, which finally excluded the papal power, and established the Royal authority in all ecclesiastical appointments; and they gave him both a subsidy for life, and appointed a committee of his creatures, vested with supreme legislative powers. The result is well known; an universal disgust was excited by a revolution which changed the government into a despotism—a revolution, too, effected by the people's representatives, and for the benefit of a Prince whose life was as disreputable and base as his capacity was mean. Henry of Lancaster was enabled to dethrone and murder him; and that family reigned for two generations peaceably, for a third with constant resistance and various fortunes during a desolating civil war. But the infirm title

of the Lancastrian Princes, although supported by the universal consent of the country, and backed by the great talents of the first and the brilliant victories of the second monarch, was in that early age a source of such weakness, that none of them ever ventured upon any excess of the legal prerogative; all of them were fain to await the will of their Parliaments for grants of money, and all of them suffered the privileges of Parliament to grow up and be consolidated.

Thus Henry IV. was no sooner seated on the throne than a Parliamentary declaration was made, that all transfer of the supreme power of legislation to any committee of Parliament was illegal. The interference of the King in elections, which had first been practised by Richard II., was complained of as soon as the importance of the Commons came to be partially felt; and the sheriff was restricted from exercising the power he had hitherto assumed of returning persons not chosen by the true majority of votes. Moreover, the Commons now began to interfere with all parts of the administration, and to insist upon being consulted on other matters as well as on questions of taxation. They were allowed to have freedom from arrest, though an Act to declare this immunity was at first refused, and only granted in the reign of Henry VI. They claimed freedom of speech; and on the sentence which had been passed on Haxy, one of their members, in the last reign, for words spoken in Parliament, being now reviewed, a complaint was made of the Speaker making verbal speeches to the Lords and the King—a practice, however, which has been continued to our time, and which gave rise, within my recollection, to a formal motion against Mr. Abbot, supported with great ability and characteristic and hereditary love of liberty by my excellent friend Lord William Russell, —that Speaker having taken upon him to pronounce an opinion against the Catholic question while addressing the Throne at the close of the session. The false entries made after the end of the session were again complained of, and it was agreed by both Houses that these should be in future made in presence of a joint committee. Grievances were regularly stated, and redress promised, previous to any supply being granted. The King was even obliged to send out of the country on one occasion persons distasteful to the Commons, among others four foreign attendants on the Queen, and against whom the King vowed that he knew no ground of complaint whatever but that the two Houses disliked them. About 1401 a most important step was made by the Commons. They required that in each grant the appropriation of the money should be determined; to which the King assented, excepting only such moderate sums as might be left at his free disposal.

The brilliant career of Henry V., and his marvellous achievement of nearly conquering France, and obtaining the French crown, which a singular combination of accidents, aiding the gallantry and skill of his military operations, enabled him to perform, while it gratified the vanity of the nation, and made his wars as popular as they were pernicious to the country, had no effect whatever upon the balance of the Constitution. On the contrary, while he always obtained his resources from the grants of the Commons, he treated respectfully their complaints; pledged himself that no alteration of the statutes, when made, should ever be permitted without their consent; and, what had never before been distinctly admitted, and what was directly contrary to the understood rule and practice in the time of the Edwards, he agreed that no statute should have any force or effect without their express assent, although they granted him the tonnage and poundage for his life—a thing never before done except in Richard II.'s reign, and on the eve of his usurping absolute power. Henry laid before them his negotiations with the Emperor Sigismund, and he applied to them for interposing the security of Parliament to the loans which his wars obliged him to contract—a precedent now first given, and unfortunately followed afterwards to so ruinous an extent. (See my *History of England and France under the House of Lancaster*.)

To his unhappy son he bequeathed the crown of France as well as England; and his quiet inheritance of both would have been ensured by the great genius of his brother, the Duke of Bedford, if anything could have maintained such a conquest, or anything could have quieted the English Barons. But, beside losing his foreign dominions, this ill-fated prince was doomed to pass a life of thraldom, of deposition, of constant vicissitudes, while his kingdom was torn by the most violent factions, and his people became a prey to all the evils of civil war. In the earlier part of his reign, indeed, he was only nominally on the throne. From his accession, at nine months old, to the age of twenty-one, he had little or no power. The regency was committed to a Council and a Protector by a resolution of the Lords, without any interposition whatever of the Commons. Thirty-two years afterwards, when he had fallen into a state of mental alienation, the Lords alone appointed a committee of their number to visit him, and ascertain his capacity; and on their report an Act was passed appointing a Protector. He recovered his reason and his authority some time after. He again fell ill, when the Commons went no further than to request that the Lords would

the duties on exported wool, and forced the merchants to give him a loan equal to the whole value of the quantity shipped by them; and he more than once seized all their wool and hides, and sold them for his own use. He equally assailed the landowners, seizing their live stock, and issuing orders to the sheriffs to collect both provisions and grain for his army.

A spirit of resistance was excited by these violent encroachments, unequalled even in the worst times of his predecessors; and the Barons, under Bohun and Bigod, so far intimidated the officers as to stop the purveyances which the King had ordered. Edward was alarmed by the proceedings of the two earls, made his peace with the clergy, gained over the citizens of London by a flattering speech, and sailed for the Continent. But he soon ordered a large levy to be made on the clergy, and thus united them with the people in support of the earls. The council appointed to assist the Prince of Wales in the regency took the same course; and Edward was compelled most reluctantly to grant a solemn confirmation of the two Charters, with this important addition, that no aid or tallage should thenceforth be raised unless by the assent of Parliament—that is, of the Prelates, Barons, Knights, and Burgesses of the realm; that no seizure of wool, hides, or other goods should be made by the Crown, nor any toll taken upon them; that all customs and penalties contrary to the Charter and to this additional article should be void; that the Charter so amended should be read twice a year in all cathedrals; and that all persons acting against it should be excommunicated.

Edward endeavoured soon after to evade the force of the obligation thus solemnly contracted; and added a clause, saving all the Crown's rights. This, when proclaimed, excited so great a clamour in the city of London, that he again became alarmed, and gave his unqualified retraction of the clause. The year after, 1300, complaint being made in Parliament that the Charters remained unexecuted, he was obliged to grant an additional article, that the Charter should be read four times a year in all the sheriffs' courts, and that three knights in each county should be chosen by the freeholders, with power from the King, to punish summarily all offences not otherwise provided for against the Charters. In the course of two or three years, however, he openly violated the new law thus made, levying tallage and poll-tax without resistance. He also appealed to the Pope to be absolved from the obligations which he had contracted; but though he obtained a Rescript declaring all his concessions void; yet, as with its artful statement of the grounds of the declaration, their having been contrary to the rights of the Crown, it added a clause securing to the subjects their ancient rights, he never ventured to use it; so that at his death, two years after, he left the famous statute prohibiting all taxation without the consent of Parliament, as the established law of the land.

Although we should admit that the provisions in the Charter, thus confirmed for the tenth time, and the important additions made to it, were but imperfectly kept, that they were so often violated as to require constant renewals with repeated pledges, no less, indeed, than fifteen times in the next reign but one, it is nevertheless certain that a prodigious advantage was gained to Constitutional Government and popular rights by the nation having the text of a treaty to cite, the provisions of a law solemnly made in writing and universally known, to rely upon in their disputes with the Crown. The Prince who now levied money without the consent of Parliament, or who assembled a few dependent Barons and Burgesses instead of the whole Lords and Commons, acted avowedly and openly an illegal part, and plainly violated a known, established, and fundamental law of the land. It might depend upon the temper of his subjects at the moment, upon the force at his command, upon his success in courting and gaining one class of men to side with him against the rest, upon the courage and patriotism of the Parliamentary and popular leaders, above all, upon his own personal endowments, and his credit with the country for an able and successful administration of its affairs, whether he should be suffered to break the law with impunity, —whether he had to dread resistance to his oppressive acts; and consequently it would naturally depend on all these circumstances whether or not he should venture upon so unlawful a course. But there can be no doubt that he was sure to be often restrained in making the attempt, sometimes opposed when he made it, and occasionally punished when he ventured so far. The most important part of the new law of Edward was the renewal of the provisions originally inserted nearly a century before, and immediately afterwards left out, with the more precise recognition of the power of Parliament, and the important addition of the County and Burgh representation. From this period we may truly say that the Constitution of Parliament, as now established, had its origin; and however that body may have occasionally had to struggle for its privileges, how often soever it may have submitted unworthily to oppression, how little soever it may have shown a determination to resist cruelty and injustice, and even a disposition to become the accomplice in such acts, we must allow that, generally speaking, it has, ever

since the end of the thirteenth century, formed a substantive and effective part of the Constitution, and that the monarchy then assumed the mixed form which it now wears. The great outline was then drawn; the details, and shades, and tints have since been filled in.

The English nation ought piously to hold in veneration the memory of those gallant and virtuous men who thus laid the foundations of a Constitution to which we are so justly attached. The conduct of the Barons in John's reign is indeed above all praise, because it was marked by as much moderation and wisdom as firmness of purpose and contempt of personal danger. They had no sooner held their Council at St. Albans, and proclaimed the Charter of Henry I., than the tyrant, landing with his foreign troops, marched to lay their estates under military execution, and take signal vengeance on their persons. Cardinal Langton, the Primate, who, though forced on the kingdom by papal domination, had ever shown himself a true patriot, stayed his progress by his peremptory remonstrances, and by his threat of excommunicating all who should engage in such a warfare, while the legal course of bringing offenders to trial was open to the Crown. He afterwards encouraged the Barons, at the Council of St. Paul's, to insist on Henry's Charter, and excited them by his persuasive eloquence to take the famous oath, which he solemnly administered to them, that they would die sooner than depart from this demand. He had already compelled John to promise the same Charter, then termed the Confessor's Laws, as the condition of reversing his excommunication. Once more, in the assembly of Bury St. Edmund's, he influenced them by his eloquence, and they took their oath at the altar, to make endless war on the King until he granted their demands. Nay, when John, in order to gain over the clergy as a last expedient, granted them a charter, abandoning all right of interfering with the choice of Bishops, and declaring that their election, though not confirmed by him, should still be valid, promising, moreover, to lead an army to Palestine, and taking the cross himself as a pledge of his pious resolution, the Primate was so little to be moved from his principles, or duped by such tricks, that he adhered to the party of the Barons throughout, only so far gained by the King as to make himself the bearer of propositions for their consideration; and, when the Pope had commanded him to yield, he positively refused to excommunicate them, according to the papal threats, but threatened to excommunicate John's foreign troops unless they were instantly disbanded.

But as the Pope's whole conduct in this important affair was wholly unjustifiable, and indeed despicable, and as his successor in Edward's time had no share in the resistance offered by the Barons, the Romish advocates are fain to claim for their Church a share, not only in the proceedings which extorted the Great Charter from John, but also in those which rendered it effectual to its purpose under Edward. Accordingly, Dr. Lingard, while he places Langton on a level with the Barons of Runnimede, pronounces Archbishop Winchelsey the author, with the two earls, Norfolk and Hereford, of the great change in 1297. Nothing can be more absurd. He wholly overlooks Langton's great praise, of having alike opposed the encroachments of Rome and of the domestic tyrant, of having faced the indignation of the Vatican, refused to execute its menaces, and used its thunder against John and his foreign mercenaries—of having shown so noble a disregard of his order and its interests, that the bribe of the January charter fell as powerless before him as the threats both of Innocent and his vassal. Winchelsey, on the contrary, was ever in league with Boniface VIII., obtained from him the bull against lay encroachments, took up his position in defence of the Church revenues behind that bulwark, was melted by Edward's speech and tears at Westminster, as much as the mere mob, to whom the crafty prince appealed against his Barons, and was evidently disarmed by the order immediately after issued in imitation of John's early Charter, so utterly scorned by Langton, to protect the clergy in the enjoyment of all their possessions; and Edward immediately took him into favour, appointing him one of the young Prince's tutors and Council as Regent in his absence. His conduct in this office has been extolled. But to what did it amount? On the Barons refusing to attend the Council's summons to Parliament unless the gates of London were given up to their keeping, Winchelsey advised that this requisition should be complied with, clearly against his duty as the Regent's chief councillor. He appears throughout to have acted an interested part, prompted solely by a regard for the interests of his order; and the whole merit of the great change which we have been contemplating belongs to the Barons, the merchants, and their leaders, Bohun of Hereford, and Bigod of Norfolk. The clergy all behaved like their Primate. Edward's concessions won them over to his side, and they left the Barons and the people. On his sailing he, forgetting these concessions, ordered a heavy tallage to be levied upon their personal property; straightway they left him, and once more took part with the country.

While Edward has justly obtained the highest

praise from lawyers for the great improvements which he introduced into our jurisprudence, we may remark that the two great changes which he made in the law were pointed in directions not merely different, but diametrically opposite. The power of the Barons and of all landed proprietors was exceedingly increased by the famous statute *de Donis*, which allowed them to entail their real property, and thus to sustain the landed aristocracy. But the restraints upon alienations to the Church by the laws of mortmain, tended exceedingly to restrain the power of the spiritual Barons, though they might also give some additional protection to the lay aristocracy.

The conquests of Edward had no sensible tendency to increase the power of the Crown. Scotland was a source of expense and of weakness. Wales was still a greater diversion to his forces, without producing the least return either in men or money. On the Continent he was generally unsuccessful, and he found the expense and defence of his dominions there fully equal to any benefit they ever yielded him.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND UNDER THE PLANTAGENETS.

THE more regular establishment of the Parliament, and the more full recognition of its privileges, was plainly to be seen in the events of the next reign. Edward, on his death-bed, had extorted a promise from his son that he would never allow his unpopular favourite, Piers Gaveston, to return from banishment without the Parliament's leave. That body made the favourite's return without their assent the ground of hostile proceedings against him, and his perpetual exile was made one of the conditions annexed to their first grant of a subsidy to Edward II. The annexing as a condition the redress of public grievances was now the course taken by them as a natural consequence of their acknowledged power to give or to withhold supplies. But a short time, however, elapsed before all regular and constitutional government was at an end, the Barons having, by an armed demonstration compelled the King to allow the appointment of a Commission, called the *Ordinances*, consisting of Prelates and Barons empowered to prepare new Ordinances for the redress of grievances. Their proceedings, agreed to by the King in Parliament, nearly resembled those of the Mad Parliament in Henry III.'s reign; as their authority was plainly modelled upon that of the Committee of Barons then appointed. Some of their Ordinances were valuable improvements, especially that regulating the choice of sheriffs; abolishing all but the ancient purveyances, and repealing the new and oppressive taxes on wool and other merchandise. One clearly resembled the Mad Parliament's law, that three Parliaments should be held yearly. The Ordinances required "one to be held each year, or oftener if need be." Another also resembled the former precedent; for it transferred the whole functions of the Crown to the Parliament. The King was bound to obtain the consent of the Barons before he could either levy war or quit the realm; and the Regent, in his absence, was to be chosen by the Parliament, whose advice and consent was also made necessary to the appointment of all the great officers of State and governors of the foreign possessions of the Crown.

The other transactions of Edward II.'s reign are immaterial to our present purpose; but throughout the whole of it there prevailed the assumption that no matter of great importance could be transacted without the presence, interference, and sanction of Parliament. Nor is there any part of the Constitution practically of more importance than the recognition of this principle. The King's deposition was effected by a Parliament which the Queen and her paramour, Mortimer, summoned at Westminster, in the name of the King, by means of the Prince whom the Prelates and Barons in their interest had named guardian of the realm, or Regent. The Parliament also passed an act of indemnity for all offences committed during the revolutionary crisis, and appointed a Council of Regency, the young sovereign being only fifteen years of age.

The weakness of the Crown in the second Edward's reign had prevented all violent measures for raising supplies by the Royal authority alone. But his son, Edward III., whose wars occasioned a great increase of expenditure, was frequently induced to exert the prerogative which, like his grandfather, he always asserted, maintaining that the famous statute of 1297 had not validly abridged it. He contended that he had the right to impose tallage "in cases of public emergency, and for reasonable cause;" nor would he even so far yield to the representations of the Commons as to declare such imposts illegal, always adding a saving clause for these extraordinary occasions. He several times, in defiance of the statute "*De Tallagio non Concedendo*," levied a tallage of his mere authority. He did so in 1338, at the beginning of the war which led to his great naval victory of Blakensberg; and moreover had recourse to forced loans, and to seizures of all the tin and wool of the year, the *Maletolte* of his grandfather. Nevertheless, the war was extremely popular with both Lords and Commons; both urged

him to prosecute it, and were satisfied with his promises that the *Maletolte* should cease in two years, to which effect a statute was made. In 1342, however, he was allowed to levy it for three years longer, by the assent of the Lords and a Council of Merchants, whom he had irregularly summoned, instead of assembling the Commons. The Parliament suffered this on express condition that no such maletolte should ever after be imposed. For some years he found that the grants of Parliament were a more convenient resource, and to these he confined himself. He yearly assembled his Parliament, and obtained grants for the prosecution of the war, illustrated as it was by the great victories of Crecy in 1346, and Poitiers in 1356, the capture of Calais in 1347, and the great sea-fight of 1350 in the Channel. The consequence of this constant recourse to Parliament was, that taxation became in some sort regulated upon a system; and sometimes when the King had exceeded his lawful authority and imposed a tax, the Parliament would, after remonstrance, themselves grant the same duty, evidently for the purpose of preventing an illegal precedent, and wisely preserving the bulk of their constitutional privileges. On one occasion, in 1346, when he had issued an ordinance that all landowners should furnish knights and archers in proportion to their rental, and each burgh so much money, the Commons remonstrated; when he stated the necessities of the war and the assent of the Lords. This, however, did not satisfy the Commons; and he promised that it should never be drawn into a precedent. Several further remonstrances followed, and an Act was passed, that for the future all such ordinances should be deemed contrary to the liberties of the realm; and further, that no petition of the clergy should be granted without the Council certifying that it contained nothing against the rights of the Lords and Commons. To all this the King assented; but when the Parliament further insisted that no statute should be made at the petition of the clergy without the consent of the Lords and Commons, he gave their request a civil refusal.

In raising men for the public service, the King, during the early reigns of the Plantagenets, appears to have been under less restraint than in raising money. This greater latitude arose from two causes: the pretext of danger to the State was always at hand —and the great bulk of the men levied were of the common people, whose interests were little regarded by the Barons, Knights, and traders that composed the Parliament. Hence we can trace hardly any limits to the King's authority in calling out his subjects on emergencies. In the Anglo-Saxon times, and even under the Anglo-Norman Princes, the reliance of the Crown was entirely upon the feudal services of the vassals with their sub-tenants; and it was a force much better calculated for hôme defence than for the operations of foreign war, because it only served for a limited time, and was seldom in the field. The number of men which the land was bound to furnish had so exceedingly decreased, from the changes in the distribution of property, and from the neglect of the public servants who had charge of the musters and arrays, that they were supposed to have been ten times more numerous in the twelfth than in the thirteenth century; and the main reliance of the Edwards was upon contracts, for men properly equipped, made with the Barons at the hire of enormous sums, as much as one shilling and sixpence a day for a mounted archer (equal to thirty shillings of our money); and upon infantry raised by mere Royal authority in the counties. It was indeed understood that no man could be compelled to leave his county unless in case of invasion; but pretexts were never wanting of such threatened dangers; and it was often urged that the interest of the people was rather to fight at a distance than have their homes ravaged by the war. Not only fighting men were thus pressed into the military service of the Crown, and vessels to carry troops abroad, sometimes all the shipping to be found in any of the ports, with as many seamen as were wanted to man them; but workmen and artificers were swept away in great numbers, and exposed to the perils of war. Thus near 400 of these were carried over to the siege of Calais in 1348. As many as 1,100 vessels were seized in this manner and used by Edward III. before the battle of Blakensberg. When, in 1346, before Crecy, he issued the ordinance which has been mentioned above, the Commons complained of the practice as regarded levies of men, inasmuch as the landowners were affected by that proceeding, and not merely the peasants. An Act was in consequence passed forbidding the carrying of any man out of his county in future, excepting in the case of actual invasion.

Such was the struggle always maintained in those times between the Crown and the Parliament—that is, between the Sovereign and the great and little Barons and the mercantile classes, then first rising into importance. There were many infractions of the laws made to protect the subject, many invasions of the Constitution as it was allowed to stand upon the provisions of the Charters, and the statutes confirming and extending those Charters. But the progress was steadily making towards a more exact observance of the law, a more secure enjoyment of popular rights, and a more strict limitation of the Royal authority. The reign of Edward III. was distinguished, as we

attainder was easily passed by the same body to gratify that powerful nobleman.

The tendency of Parliaments in those times to obey the Royal dictates, is perhaps still more clearly seen in the early acts of Mary than even in all their subserviency to her father. The restoration of the Catholic religion and the Romish supremacy was accomplished by this young woman with a severe struggle, it is true, but accomplished by a person void of capacity, without any experience, unpopular in her address, only armed with the name and prerogative of royalty, only supported by her own fanatical firmness of purpose, and by the remains of the sect which had been defeated and crushed in the two former reigns. The resistance made, though ineffectually, to this change is rather a proof that religious feeling will arm men against the influence of their fears or their sycophancy; it was the only sure indication of the Parliament having recovered its tone.

The Spanish marriage, however, confirmed and increased the opposition which the Queen's bigotry at first excited; and her third Parliament rejected some of her favourite bills. The care taken by her to influence the House of Commons, where alone she encountered any opposition, illustrates this still further. Edward had added twenty-two burghs, of which seven were insignificant and easily influenced. She enlarged the number by fourteen, and she wrote also a circular letter to the sheriffs, directing them to recommend good Catholics to the electors; and the Spanish ambassador is believed to have applied the influence of money directly in favour of the marriage with Philip. The French ambassador addressed himself zealously to the same quarter, the Commons, while engaged in resisting the Queen's profligate and infatuated design of transferring her kingdom to the Spanish monarchy, and lavishly promised the aid of France against this abominable scheme.

In all these four reigns, as well as in that of Elizabeth, the criminal judicature of the Privy Council, exercised in one branch called sometimes the King's Ordinary Council, sometimes the Council of Star Chamber, from the ceiling of the room in which it met, was a very important addition to the Royal authority, and a great restraint upon both the Parliament and the people. The Crown had recourse to this power originally in order to control the factions of domineering Barons, who, yielding to the forms of the ordinary jurisdiction, entirely defeated its substance by overpowering the juries and even the judges before whom they or their retainers were brought, and by whom their civil rights were decided. A statute had been made early in Henry VII.'s reign confirming the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber in cases of combinations to obstruct the due administration of justice; and there can be no doubt that much benefit resulted from the interference of the body, in times when the feudal power reduced the judicial to a mere name whenever great men or their followers were concerned. The preamble to the statute I have just mentioned sets forth, that by the practices of the great men, the "police and good rule of the realm was almost subdued, and the security of all men living, their lands and goods destroyed." But the most grievous abuses arose out of this Star Chamber jurisdiction; and the Sovereign was enabled by it, not only to intimidate all who would oppose him legally in Parliament, as well as factiously in the country, but to interfere with the administration of justice fully as much as the Barons had ever done, and more systematically. Not only did the Plantagenets and the Tudors commit to prison or ransom for heavy fines those against whom they conceived an ill will, thus depriving them of the protection of the common law, and signally violating the most remarkable provision of the Great Charter; but they exercised a like control over members of Parliament who had offended them, and jurors who had given verdicts displeasing to them; committing such members and jurors, interrogating them, sentencing them to imprisonment, and only releasing them on payment of heavy fines. A capital jurisdiction was never exercised by them, at least directly; but it really amounted to the same thing, whether they sentenced obnoxious men to death or compelled timid jurors to find them guilty through dread of personal consequences. It was in this Council that all the Sovereign's more violent acts were performed, because he was thus covered over with an apparent authority by the concurrence of an ancient body. Mary committed by its sentence a knight to the Tower, for his opposition to her in Parliament. She committed to prison by a like order in Council all the jury that acquitted Throckmorton; four were released on acknowledging their offence; the others proving refractory were fined, some in the enormous sum of £2,000.

It even appears that individual Privy Councillors, assuming to be clothed, as it were, with an emanation of Royal authority, would commit persons who offended them. As late as the latter part of Elizabeth's reign (1592) there was a representation made by eleven of the twelve Judges to the Chancellor and Treasurer, complaining that this outrageous power was used to prevent parties from

bringing actions, as well as to punish or threaten them for other lawful acts.

Other interferences with the administration of justice were likewise practised by the Crown. The Sheriffs selected Jurors according to the Crown's presumed, and frequently declared, wishes. That officer was always employed as representing the Sovereign in his Bailiwick. Thus we find letters from two of Elizabeth's Council, to which one Ashburnham had presented his complaint, but without prosecuting it, requiring that the Sheriff of Sussex should not aid his creditors to molest him until the pleasure of the Council be known. An appellate jurisdiction in earlier times appears to have been exercised by the same body. A case, mentioned in Hale's MS., was lately cited by our Judges before the House of Lords (Reg. *v.* Milliss), showing that the Star Chamber had revised a judgment of the Common Pleas in a real action—a Writ of Dower.

The Star Chamber took upon it to superintend the abuses of the Press. It prohibited the circulation of Roman Catholic works, and ordered them to be seized. With its concurrence Elizabeth issued a proclamation for trying by martial law the importers of bulls and libels; another, denouncing capital punishment against those who attended riotous meetings, or committed acts of vagrancy; and a third, ordering Anabaptists to quit the realm, and Irishmen to return home.

The power of regulating generally all matters punishable by law, and of enforcing by particular modes things commanded by statutes which did not describe the means of their enforcement, was always, under the Tudors as well as the Plantagenets, assumed by the Crown; and within this general and important head came, under both families, the power of regulating commerce. But the Tudors much more rarely interfered to levy money without Parliamentary sanction; and Elizabeth only once appears to have done so, when she imposed a duty on sweet wines, and retained one of her sister's duties on foreign cloths. She also, in 1586, made the Clergy pay an assessment not voted by Convocation. Loans or benevolences were two or three times exacted by her, notwithstanding the statute of Richard III.; but her economy always enabled her to repay them; and she was truly said to have been the first sovereign in whose reign the constitutional right of Parliament to grant supplies was practically made of universal application.

The independence of Parliament generally was much more secure under her than under her father or her sister; and it showed a far higher spirit, notwithstanding her strong assertions of her prerogative, and her exalted notion of its extent. In her father's time the Commons had punished, with his concurrence, those who arrested members during the session. This under her reign became a common assertion of privilege; and both strangers and members were now severely punished for contempts of the House and its jurisdiction. Even with the Queen herself the Commons ventured to struggle, in a way very different from anything that her father would have borne. They disregarded her positive commands, intimated through the Speaker, that they should no longer discuss the question of her naming a successor; and though she continued to desire that they should leave matters of State alone, she nevertheless revoked her former injunction.

The Commons may be said to have obtained another victory over her in their remonstrance against Monopolies—an oppressive source of revenue, but one not denied to have been vested in the Crown. In the session 1571, though Bacon, the Chancellor, had, in answer to their claims of liberty of speech, renewed the recommendation against meddling with State affairs, the Commons began their struggle against that great abuse. The Queen, who set great store by this prerogative, calling it the fairest flower of her garden, desired them to spend little time in motions, and make no long speeches. The chief mover against monopolies (one Bell) was called before the Star Chamber and frightened; the Lord Keeper Bacon severely reprimanded them at the close of the session for meddling "with matters not pertaining to them, nor within the capacity of their understanding." Next year, however, the new Parliament chose Bell for their Speaker, but proceeded no further; indeed, they seem to have been terrified by the proceedings in the Star Chamber at the close of the last session, and they begged the Queen, on presenting their bills, "not to form an ill opinion of the House if she should dislike them." The next time they met, the most bold and even violent language against her infringement of their privileges was freely used; and she was plainly told, that if they had committed faults, "so had she great and dangerous ones," and taxed her with "ingratitude and unkindness to her people." Wentworth, the person who had led the way in this freedom of speech, was committed to the Tower for a month, and reprimanded on being discharged when the Queen had forgiven him. At their next meeting, in 1581, the usual warning as to interfering in State affairs was given. Wentworth was again committed to the Tower by the House, and detained till its dissolution, for new acts of boldness in debate. Again, in 1588, he moved on the question of the succession, and was, with one who seconded him, committed by

the Council to prison; as was another member soon after for presenting a bill against abuses in Ecclesiastical Courts, contrary to the Queen's injunction. She did not release them while the session lasted, although petitioned by the House on the ground that no subsidies could be granted from places whose members were in custody. At length, although in 1597 the Queen prevailed on them by soft and pleasing words to leave the remedy of monopolies to her care, yet finding she did not correct the abuse, in 1601, after four days' debate, and the refusal of the Commons to adopt the contemptible advice of Cecil and Bacon, that they should proceed by petition and not by bill, the Queen sent a message to promise a general revocation of all such grants as were found on trial to be against law.

The importance of the House of Commons in Elizabeth's reign, as in that of her sister and brother, is evinced by the pains taken to secure an ascendancy in it. She added no less than sixty-two burgh members, chiefly by enfranchising petty burghs under royal or noble influence. The general attendance was under 240, and hence those new members must have given great weight to the Crown. The ministers and the peers also used every exertion to influence elections elsewhere.

The services rendered by the Tudors to religion, in freeing us from the yoke of Rome and the superstitions of Popery, have been more than once glanced at. But it must be recollected that these favours were bestowed with the characteristic tyranny of the family. Nothing can be more clear than the connection between Henry VIII.'s revolt against the Pope and his desire to break his first marriage, from his wish to espouse Anne Boleyn; and his adherence to the Catholic errors not only lasted for life, but was testified in the most arbitrary Acts of his reign,—Acts which his submissive Parliament almost immediately enabled him to pass. The very worst, perhaps, of all his statutes is that called the "*Law of the Six Articles*," or, as the Protestants termed it, "*The Bloody Act*," made after he had reigned thirty years and had separated from Rome five years. Some of the grossest errors of Romanism were there laid down as undoubted truths, including transubstantiation, the obligation of monastic vows, clerical celibacy and auricular confession, and were commanded to be believed on pain of death, without power of escape by abjuring errors once uttered: so that if any person once denied the real presence, though he afterwards confessed his error and recanted, he was liable to be burnt.

The cruelties of Mary are known and are proverbial; they have prevented us from reflecting how entirely her Parliament, so lately Protestant, supported her in them, and how far her sister went in following her example. It cannot be doubted that the Reformation in Elizabeth's reign was carried by force, even by military force, as far as the people were concerned; for they adhered to the religion of their forefathers. Bishop Burnet, a witness wholly above all suspicion on such a point, is constrained to allow that she had to send over German troops in 1549 from Calais, on account of the Catholic bigotry of the nation at large. The use made of the Church revenues, too, deserves our attention. Henry VIII. was not the only Sovereign who endowed great families out of this spoil. In Edward's time, Winchester and Canterbury suffered much for this purpose; Exeter and Llandaff were impoverished, and Lichfield was stripped to endow Lord Paget. Somerset House was founded out of Church lands by the Protector. Cecil's estate at Burleigh was made out of Peterborough: part of Hatton's in Holborn retains the name which shows that it had belonged to Ely; and Lord Keeper Puckering obtained it for a simoniacal prelate, that he might obtain a part of the estate on lease for himself.

Elizabeth, though friendly at all times to the Reformation, held the Puritans in far more hatred than the Catholics, on account of their republican propensities and their dislike of the episcopal discipline. It was against them that the Act compelling all persons to go to Church under pecuniary penalties was passed; an Act never yet repealed, and of late warmed into a noxious vitality, after being long torpid, in consequence of some magistrates having failed to convict some poor men of poaching.

The præmunire Act was extended so as to subject all the Catholics in the country to capital punishment for refusing a second time to abjure their religion—a law so cruel that the Queen never ventured to execute it generally. An Act punishing with death any publication containing seditious matters, or defaming the Queen, was wrested to include the offence of writing against the Liturgy, and Puritans suffered death under this strange perversion. Many Catholics also suffered under an Act making it high treason to import bulls, relics, or crosses; and others, after being tortured to confess having denied the Queen's supremacy, were executed.

The Anabaptists were also persecuted; many driven beyond the seas; some burnt for heresy; sixty-one clergymen, forty-seven laymen, and two ladies suffered death in misery for being Catholics during fourteen years of this Queen's reign. To all these vile proceedings Elizabeth's Parliaments were as

willing parties, or as callous instruments, as their predecessors in the time of Henry and Mary. The support, therefore, of the Reformation, whether by the father or the daughter, is rather to be regarded as an indication of that body's subserviency and the Sovereign's power, than any proof of the progress that had been made by constitutional liberty.

Upon the whole, however, there can be no doubt that the Parliament had become more independent and the Crown more under restraint in the reign of Elizabeth, high as were her notions of prerogative, and submissively as her reproofs were generally received; and the Speaker, Onslow, was justified in his remark upon the difference between our government and those of the continental kingdoms—justified by the fact, but also justified by the safety with which in her time the Commons could address language to the throne such as her father would never have permitted to be used in his presence. "By our common law," said he, "though there be for the Prince provided many princely prerogatives, yet it is not such as that the Prince can take money or other things, or do as he will at his own pleasure without order; but quietly to suffer their subjects to enjoy their own without wrongful oppression, wherein other Princes by their liberty do take as pleaseth them."

Let us now mark the main causes of the subserviency which so utterly disgraced the Tudor Parliaments, until under Elizabeth they gradually began to feel some sense of their duty, and to show, though but rarely and faintly, some spirit of resistance. For we must lay entirely out of our view in considering this subject the violent Acts of Henry VIII.'s Parliament, authorizing him to repeal statutes and giving his proclamations the force of law. These Acts were only, like the attainders in which they concurred with their master, indications of their submission to his will, and not real alterations effected in the Constitution, and enlarging the powers of the Crown. But the causes of that general submission, and the circumstances which enabled the Tudors to reign so absolutely in a limited Monarchy, were these:—

In the *first* place, the character of the Aristocracy, in whose hands the whole Parliamentary power was vested. They were a half-civilized, imperfectly enlightened, and exceedingly unprincipled body, just emerged from a state of feudal anarchy, repressed by the Sovereign's increased and constitutional authority, careless of what befell their countrymen at large, only anxious each for himself and his own retainers, and all willing rather to find protection in their individual power and following, than to seek it from the safeguards which the laws and institutions of a country provide for all both high and low within its bounds. No tenderness for liberty, no feeling for the rights of the community, no regard for the laws could be expected from a body so constituted. The Lords were always found ranged on the side of power and of the Prince. —*Secondly*, the Commons were exceedingly affected, as, indeed, were the less powerful of the Lords, by the powers which the Sovereign exercised through the Council, the Star Chamber. Examples were occasionally made of punishing by fine and imprisonment discontented members; and the course of justice was, as we have seen, materially affected by the operations of the same force.—*Thirdly*—and to this I attach much greater weight, because otherwise the powers of the Star Chamber never could have stood against an united legislature—there was operating in favour of the Crown, and against all resistance, that principle which gives every established government the greater portion of its solidity, by preventing all effective opposition; that principle which enabled the triumvirs of France, in 1793, to domineer through terror over both the Convention and the people for nearly two long years of suffering and crime. Men distrust each other; every man fears to be made the sacrifice were he to move first; as no one in a mob will rush willingly on, till forced by those behind him, upon a single individual armed with a pistol; because each knows that though it can kill but one, he may be the one. Who could venture to protest for a moment against any of Henry's worst schemes of profligacy and cruelty when he felt that an attainder would be suddenly propounded against himself, should he oppose the attainment pressed upon the legislature, and he must be the sacrifice to the honest discharge of a public duty? Nothing else can account for the obsequious and pusillanimous demeanour of the Parliament, first under the Plantagenets, but afterwards far more under the Tudors.

The personal character of these Tudor Princes entered for something into this account of their tyranny, because the main stay of their power was the terror which operated upon the Commons, with their distrust of one another, and their reckoning upon the Lords always taking the Sovereign's part. Accordingly we find them far more inclined to follow an independent course under Edward and the Regency than under any of the other four princes of that family. We also observe them kept down by dread of Elizabeth while she was in the vigour of her faculties and the height of her pride. The favourite subject of the monopolies had been somewhat broached by the Commons as early as 1566; it was very openly taken up in 1572; but the fear of her indignation afterwards

made them press it very feebly till towards the end of her reign, when her energy being impaired rather by the melancholy that clouded her latter days than by the hand of age, they could venture upon matters which at a former period they dared not broach.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS—THE COMMONWEALTH—THE RESTORATION.

THE bold, determined, impetuous character of the Tudors suddenly found a great contrast in the feeble mind and contemptible manners of James I.; and though his capacity was far from mean, and his acquirements were very considerable, both his abilities and his accomplishments were of a kind the least useful on the throne; consequently the genius of Elizabeth, peculiarly formed for command, was as manifestly superior to his as the vigour of her masculine nature surpassed his paltry disposition. Men were not slow to mark the change in the hand that now held the sceptre; the statesmen perceived it in a day; the Parliament showed that they were aware of it on the morrow of their meeting.

Accordingly, with this Prince began the real contest between the Crown and the Parliament, which ended in the full establishment of our free Constitution. A movement in this direction had been made in Elizabeth's time; towards the end of her reign it had become very perceptible; and no attentive observer could doubt that even under the same race of vigorous and able tyrants who had long filled the throne, the increased importance of the towns from the progress of commerce, and the daily diminishing influence of the feudal aristocracy, as well as the gradual diffusion of knowledge, accelerated with the spread of free principles since the Reformation, would in time have occasioned the same great and useful struggle. But the change of the family, and the character of its first Sovereign, contributed much to bring on this conflict, and give it a turn favourable to liberty. This, however, was in no wise owing to any moderate views entertained by the Stuarts of their prerogative; on the contrary, they held this fully as high as the Tudors.

It has been remarked by writers on our Constitutional History, and particularly by Mr. Hallam, that, singularly enough, the family which held such lofty notions of Royal prerogative and rights of legitimacy (as they are now termed) should themselves have owed their succession to the very influence of which they most were jealous, deriving their sole title to the crown of England from the people, whose right to interfere with such high and sacred subjects they wholly denied. Perhaps this discrepancy between their title and their principles is more apparent than real. It is perfectly true that an Act of Parliament gave Henry VIII. the power of naming his successor, and limiting the Crown to any series of heirs whom he might choose to appoint in a will executed by himself. It is equally true that he named the Suffolk family, descended from his youngest sister, and passed by the King of Scots, issue of Margaret. Much doubt has been cast upon the point whether or not the will was signed by him; whether, as the lawyers say, the power was well or ill executed. The balance of evidence appears in favour of the due execution; and there was lawful issue of the Countess of Suffolk living at Elizabeth's decease. So far the succession of James appears to have been precluded by statute, and he only to have been let in by the voice of the Nation disapproving the Act of Harry's Parliament, which had, however, never been repealed, and by the recognition of his now first Parliament in a statute declaring his title. But there can be no doubt that the same persons who maintained the high prerogative doctrines of the Stuarts, would equally deny the right of Parliament in Henry VIII.'s time to set aside the elder or Stuart branch, and to substitute, by Henry's appointment, the younger. They regarded the title by hereditary succession as paramount to any legislative enactment. If any proof of this were wanting, surely it is furnished by the Jacobites persisting in regarding their Stuart Kings as the true and lawful Kings of England, after the Crown had been limited to a younger branch of the family, and possession held under that limitation for near a century. The inconsistency is thus rather apparent than real; though the absurdity of the Stuart doctrine is as flagrant as if it were not irreconcilable with itself.

James, in his proclamation for summoning his first Parliament, had required that neither Bankrupts nor Outlaws should be returned. One Goodwin, who had been outlawed, was returned for Buckinghamshire. The Return was refused at the Crown Office, and Fortescue was elected in his stead. The Commons, as soon as they assembled, unseated him, and declared Goodwin duly elected. This brought on a controversy with the King; and the Commons asserting their undoubted privilege to decide upon all elections, it ended in a compromise that neither Goodwin nor Fortescue should sit. Immediately afterwards, a member arrested for debt was liberated by a summary

application to the Crown; and an Act was passed declaring the privilege of Parliament, and indemnifying the Sheriffs and Gaolers for setting free all members so committed to their custody. Moreover, when the King upon one or two occasions would take notice of speeches and proceedings in the House of Commons, they drew up a full statement of their privileges; and as he had referred to the freedom of speech asked and granted at the beginning of each Parliament, they distinctly affirmed that it was their right without any grant, and that their asking it was a mere form, and "words of manners only." He persevered in alluding to their proceedings, and they persisted in complaining of this as against their undoubted privileges.

But he on one occasion went much beyond this, and ventured to impose a duty on currants imported. One Bates, having imported without paying the duty, was sued in the Exchequer, where the Barons supported the King's right to levy the customs, and used arguments still more base and slavish than their judgment. The Commons took up the subject, and the King desired they would not interfere. They however maintained, in most explicit terms, their undoubted right to discuss every one grievance of the subject; and so effectual was their resistance, that when soon after he would have raised money by making victuallers pay for a license to retail wines, he was obliged by the representation of the Commons to revoke his proclamation. It must be added, with some feelings of shame, that Lord Coke himself agreed with the Court of Exchequer in their judgment on Bates's case, though for very different and far less objectionable reasons; and in his Book he distinctly condemns the case as decided against law. (2 *Inst.*, 57.) The Court, too, over which he presided, declared the issuing of proclamations creating new offices to be unlawful, on the ground that the Crown had no power to alter the law of the land.

The authority of Bates's case and of Lord Coke's concurrence had encouraged the King to levy customs without Act of Parliament at the outports—the absurd distinction being taken by the Judges between these and the Port of London and Cinque Ports. But the Commons strongly remonstrated against this proceeding as wholly illegal, and refused all supply until these demands were withdrawn. The consequence was an interval of six years before any new Parliament was called; and, in the meantime, James was put to many shifts for obtaining pecuniary assistance. He was fain to ask loans from wealthy citizens as a favour; and failing to get supplies from this source, he had recourse to his well-known expedient, the sale of Honours. He invented the order of Baronets, and sold the title for £1,000. About 200 were created, but not much more than half were at first so disposed of. One St. John, who had incurred his displeasure by writing a treatise recommending men not to advance their money by way of loan, was imprisoned by the Star Chamber and fined £5,000—a striking proof that even now, when the Commons had their attention strenuously directed to the Royal claims, and were occupied in maintaining the privileges of Parliament and rights of the people, they were not yet prepared for laying the axe to the root of the great evil, the illegal proceedings of that court. They, however, obtained from him an unlawful order, probably through that arbitrary court, prohibiting the publication or sale of a work which appeared, written by one Cowell, and asserting in the most absurd terms the absolute powers of the Sovereign and the insignificance of Parliament by the constitution of England. It must be added that in all these struggles the High Church party uniformly took part with the Crown, and against the Parliament; and thus was begun that mutual enmity which half a century later overturned the Ecclesiastical establishment of the realm.

The attainders of individuals under the Tudors had formed the most hateful and disgusting part of their domination, and of the Parliament's pusillanimity. In James's reign the attacks upon individuals were almost all grounded upon sound and just principles, and did great good to the Constitution. They proceeded, not from the King, but the Commons, and not seldom were levelled at Ministers of the Crown. The right of impeachment had not been exercised since the Lancastrian Princes were on the throne. Now, all great delinquents were visited with its terrors. For the Commons impeached Mompesson of frauds and abuse, and oppressive use of patents he had obtained; Marshall, his accomplice; Barnet, a judge of the Prerogative Court, for corruption in his judicial conduct; the Bishop of Llandaff for bribery; and Middlesex for bribery and official corruption. It must be confessed that the Commons carried occasionally their privileges somewhat further. The grossest case of oppression on record in the history of Parliament, one not exceeded by any act of the most despotic of Princes, is Lloyd's; but religious zeal here mingled with their own privileges. The King was understood to be less warmly interested in his support of the Elector Palatine against the Emperor than suited the Protestant tastes of the Commons. This unfortunate gentleman, a Catholic, was represented as having used expressions disparaging to the Palatine and his wife—a charge which, if ever so fully proved, could in no conceivable

way touch the privileges of Parliament. He was sentenced by a vote of the House to ride ignominiously on a horse with his face towards the tail, to stand in the Pillory, to be whipped from London to Westminster, to pay a fine of £5,000, and to be imprisoned for life; and all of this iniquitous sentence he underwent except the whipping.

This Parliament, the last in James's reign, closed with an open quarrel between them and the King. A remonstrance respecting his slackness in supporting the Palatine, his son-in-law, drew from him a severe reproof, in which he ascribed their freedom of speech to the Royal forbearance. The Commons took fire at this, and asserted in the loudest tone their absolute independence and supremacy. He was far from yielding; and dissolved them with a new reprimand—adding, however, that he should continue to govern by Parliaments. But, as soon as they separated he committed several of the opposition leaders, among others Sir E. Coke and Mr. Pym, to prison.

While the Commons were thus establishing their power, and boldly facing the Crown, it is humiliating to think that the Judges, from whom so much better things might have been expected, showed, with one single illustrious exception, the most base subserviency and the most unblushing abandonment of principle. Being asked by the King if he had a right to stay any judicial proceedings as often as he deemed his interest or the prerogative of the Crown assailed, all, except Lord Coke, humbly testified their submission to his demands, and in a tone of meanness and an abject spirit yet more disgusting than the answer itself. Little wonder, then, is it that we find Fuller, a lawyer, committed to prison, and there kept till he died—his offence being that he sued out a writ of Habeas Corpus for a client detained by the Court of High Commission; or Whitelock and Selden threatened with the like fate, and averting it by humble apology,—their offence having been, the just and true opinion they had given their clients that certain acts of the Government were illegal.

Notwithstanding these illegal acts, and notwithstanding the shameful dereliction of their most plain and obvious duties by the Judges, the liberties of the people gained prodigiously in James I.'s reign.—Now it was that the Commons first entered into a contention with the Crown for the vindication of their rights, and for the restoration of those securities to the lives and properties of their constituents which had repeatedly been declared to be theirs by law in the various renewals of the Great Charter, and in the laws extorted from the Plantagenets.—Now it was that the encroachments of those Princes, and the still further usurpations of the Tudors, were exposed, and the only fit and effectual means taken to restore the constitution, and extend its spirit through its details. The greatest abuse of all, indeed, the powers assumed by the Privy Council in the Star Chamber and High Commission, continued; but its operation was closely watched; and all men saw that the conflict which had begun between the Crown and the country, under the guidance of an unskilful Monarch, on the one hand, obstinate, perverse, presumptuous, but of limited capacity for State affairs, and the great men of the day, the Cokes, the Wentworths, the Pyms, must end sooner or later in a popular victory. The "universal fermentation," which Mr. Hume (Chap. xlv.) describes as about the beginning of the seventeenth century, occasioned by the revival of letters, then first became operative in the diffusion of knowledge among the people, at least among the bettermost classes, enlarged men's ideas, and by a necessary consequence led to discussions of political rights, and dissatisfaction with abuses of all kinds; and, fortunately for the cause of constitutional freedom, this was the very period chosen by the Stuart family and their infatuated adherents in Church and State for promulgating the highest notions of arbitrary authority, contemning all popular privileges, and setting the Sovereign above all human ordinances by a right claimed as inherent in the blood of Princes, and derived immediately from Heaven. The frankness with which these revolting doctrines were openly and explicitly proclaimed, although not at all greater than was shown by their Tudor ancestors, produced a far more strenuous opposition, because the age to which they were addressed was very differently instructed, considerable progress had even been made by the Parliament in an opposite direction, and the freedom of religious opinion inculcated by the Reformation was calculated inevitably to extend itself also to State affairs. It was another blessing derived from the same family, that their capacity was far inferior to their pretensions—that the unyielding obstinacy of their nature was supported by no skill, not always by adequate firmness in pursuing its object.

It was in these circumstances that the memorable reign of Charles I. began, and that the struggle between the Crown and the Commons descended to him from his father with that crown, and lined it with thorns.

In character he materially differed from his predecessor. More courageous, more manly, of more winning address, of less pedantic conceit, and, though not

deficient in accomplishments, yet not priding himself on those which fit men rather for the contests of the college than for those of public life, he was, nevertheless, far less honest and sincere, more unforgiving, quite as selfish, and altogether as much embued with the notions of his paramount rights, and his contempt for those of the people. His private conduct was more pure, and his religious impressions more strong; but he as easily tolerated breaches of morality and decorum in others; and in religion he was as intolerant, with a leaning towards Popery, which was enlarged by an imperious and bigoted wife, and a profligate, unprincipled favourite (Buckingham), fondly cherished by him as he had been by his father, recommended by none but superficial accomplishments and abandoned character, and who proved one of the chief banes of his early life.

His first measure in this warfare to which he was doomed must be allowed to have been as bad a one as was possible, for it was a trick; it deserved not the more respectable name of a stratagem. He caused the popular leaders to be named Sheriffs, that they might not be returned to Parliament; but the only consequence was their being chosen for other places. Thus, Coke, the avowed leader of the Opposition, was elected for Derbyshire instead of Norfolk, of which he had been named Sheriff. His next step was of more open violence, and according to the very worst example of past times, no longer safe to be followed. Digges and Elliot, two of the most distinguished friends of liberty, were cast into prison for words spoken in Parliament; for having taken part in the impeachment of the favourite. This ill-judged step was no sooner taken than retracted, on the House declaring they would proceed to no business until their members were released; and he was fain to confess that he had been mistaken. A peer, too, Arundel, whom he had imprisoned, was released on the claim solemnly made by the Lords that none of their members could be arrested unless for treason, felony, or a breach of the peace. They gained another success on the important right of each Peer to have his writ of Summons, which had been refused to Bristol, and which was now issued on their remonstrance.

To screen Buckingham, whose fall he perceived was doomed, Charles now had recourse to a step which he repeated several times, in spite of the warning he each time received, that of dissolving the Parliament—the result inevitably being a new one afterwards elected, with increased hostility towards the Royal authority which had put an end to the old. Money had been voted, but no bill passed; and he foolishly thought he might assess all his subjects to a loan of the amount voted, each according to the portion he would have paid if the subsidy had been enacted by law, requiring the names of those who refused their money to be reported before the Privy Council. This was followed up by pressing the inferior people to the Navy, and ordering only gentlemen to be committed by the Council. Five of these, including the illustrious Hampden, sued out their Habeas Corpus, and the return being that they were detained according to the exigency of the commitment, the sufficiency of the return, and consequently the validity of the writ of commitment, came before the Court of King's Bench, the Judges of which, to their lasting disgrace, decided in favour of both. But the King was forced to call another Parliament, the third of his reign; and now was assembled that truly illustrious body to whose wisdom and fortitude we owe our liberties, in spite of the over violence by which its successors outdid its great example, and the inexorable tyranny of the faithless Prince with whom they had to deal.

Bent on his destruction, while yet the elections had not been finished, Charles at the moment that he paid court to his subjects, by releasing persons from unlawful imprisonment, employed Commissions to raise money just as unlawfully, their orders being "to regard the necessity of the substance more than the form and circumstance;" in other words, the want of supplies for an impolitic war of the favourite's advising, rather than the illegality of robbing the people against law. The result was that famous proceeding, the Petition of Right, whereby the Lords and Commons obliged the King to declare the illegality of requiring loans without Parliamentary sanction, or billeting soldiers, or commitment without legal process, or procedure by martial law. When, however, they further required him to give up the right of levying tonnage and poundage, the infatuated monarch again had recourse to a dissolution, which was immediately followed by the imprisonment of opposition leaders. Elliot was prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench for words spoken in Parliament, and the Judges as usual, servilely and profligately aquiesced, affirming the jurisdiction, and allowing a conviction—a judgment which was solemnly reversed by Writ of Error, as contrary to law, after the Restoration (1667). Other instances of judicial baseness were also exhibited on this occasion; but when the merciful King, the Sacred Martyr, wished to have Felton put to the rack for the murder of his favourite, the Judges could not go quite so far; they declared torture to be illegal. A majority of seven to five soon after (1640) decided that the levying ship money was legal without consent of Parliament, in Hampden's case. But the Commons went a step

further than their purpose required, as usually happens when in troublous times such strong measures are resorted to; they visited every word spoken or written in disparagement of their proceedings with the penalties of breach of privilege; thus at once declaring themselves above all censure, and founding their claim of absolute power upon a fiction of absolute infallibility. They even treated respectful petitions as breaches of privilege.

The oppressions of the Star Chamber were multiplied at the same time. A greater number of punishments were inflicted, and severe ones, perfectly odious and revolting to the feelings of mankind, especially when compared with the station of the parties and the nature of the charges, were more frequent than even under the Tudors. Thus, not only the pillory, but whipping, slitting the nose, and cutting off the ears, were ordinary inflictions; and fines, so heavy as sometimes to reach £12,000, were exacted, of which the greater portion always went to the King, thus forming an important item of his revenue. Of the kind of crimes thus visited we may form an estimate from this, that one person paid £8,000 for having said "Suffolk is base born;" and that Laud made Bishop Williams be condemned to pay the like sum, of which £3,000 went to himself as a compensation, for that Prelate having written a letter in which the Primate was turned into ridicule by a single expression. He was likewise imprisoned three years for the same jest, and for being so partial to it as to refuse apologizing to the indignant metropolitan. For some libel on the Church, Leighton was whipped, pilloried, had his nose slit and his ears cut off, and was condemned to prison for life; Lilburn was whipped and pilloried, and Pryme suffered two several inflictions, the second of which cut off whatever of his ears the former had spared.

The discontent occasioned by such proceedings, and the impossibility of obtaining the necessary supplies by all the violence to which he had had recourse, and with all the support he derived from an unprincipled bench of Judges, forced Charles to assemble Parliament, after an eleven years' intermission. It met in April, 1640, and, showing great moderation, united with as much firmness as had distinguished its predecessor, it was dissolved after it had sat three weeks. The increased rigour of his illegal exactions soon increased the prevailing discontent, in which his favour towards the religion of his Queen, and its professors, especially those in her service, entered largely; and after in vain seeking to evade the necessity he most feared, by assembling a great Council at York of all the Peers, he was obliged by their advice to summon that Parliament which in a short time overthrew his authority and brought him to the block.

The first proceedings of this celebrated assembly were admirable in every respect, and marked by equal firmness and moderation. They passed a bill to secure the calling of Parliaments every three years, and prevent any interruption for more than that period of their authority: the Lords to issue writs if the Crown refused; the Sheriffs if the Lords refused; the Electors if the Sheriffs refused. This triennial bill likewise prohibited the King from dissolving without its consent, until it had sitten fifty days. The judgment in Hampden's case was then reversed; all levies of customs, and generally all imports, without consent of Parliament, were declared illegal, and strictly forbidden; all pressing of soldiers, unless in case of actual invasion; and as the crowning work, without which neither Parliament nor people could be safe for an hour, the Star Chamber and High Commission Courts were for ever abolished, by depriving the Privy Council of all jurisdiction in criminal matters, and confining it to the more necessary operations of police, and commitment for trial by due course of law. The King submitted to pass all these important bills, but he interfered with the debates upon them, and this was so far resented by the Parliament that no instance is known of that offence against privilege being repeated.

These were great and glorious achievements; and these must bound our praise of this renowned body. Their whole subsequent proceedings were framed, possibly intended, to alter the form of the Government, and not to protect it from attacks. The impeachment of Strafford alone of these violent acts leaves a doubt on the mind whether it were justified or not. The destroying him, and by attainder, was plainly without any excuse. The ruining him in the King's estimation, or rather the preventing his future employment by intimidating his master, was perhaps necessary from his talents, his courage, his influence with Charles, and the part he had since his apostasy openly and zealously taken against the people. His tyrannical and unconstitutional proceedings furnished a sufficient ground for convicting him of high crimes and misdemeanours. But the pretext that it was necessary to take his life because there was no other way of securing the people against so powerful an adversary was exactly the reason which Henry VIII. would have given for destroying his victims. The manner of accomplishing his destruction was borrowed by the Parliament from the example of that tyrant; the right which they had to destroy him, if grounded on their fears of his power and talents, was no better

than Henry's right to put any formidable opponent to death; and the shameful submission of Charles, contrary to every principle of duty and conscience, was exactly a counterpart of the subserviency of the Parliament to his despotic predecessor in passing his bills of attainder.

The other acts of the Long Parliament are without excuse, and placed beyond any question. The Act to prevent a dissolution without their own consent was an open and audacious assumption of supreme power, not by the people, but by a number of individuals, who thus made themselves absolute, and established an oligarchy, rather than a democracy, in their own persons. It was passed with a truly revolutionary speed, being brought in upon the 5th of May, carried to the Lords on the 7th, and agreed to by them on the 8th; so that in three days the whole Constitution was changed, and the King's power became little more than nominal. The Bishops were then excluded from Parliament; and the King's assent to this was his last concession. What followed was done by main force, and on the eve of taking arms, or in the midst of that din which proverbially puts all law to silence.

The immediate causes of the rebellion were, *first*, the religious zeal, or rather fury, excited by the encouragement which the King and Queen gave to Popery, and which was greatly magnified, at least as concerned him. The alarm of the Protestants at the danger to their religion, not only drove many churchmen into the communion of the Puritans, but led the Parliament to the most preposterous assumption of privilege. Thus they treated as a question of privilege any alteration in the ceremonial of worship, declaring all "new-fangled ceremonies" to be a breach of their undoubted privileges. This was, of course, levelled at Laud, whose tendency towards Popery closely resembled that of a powerful body of the clergy in our own times.—In the *second* place a conspiracy was discovered of some leading persons in the King's party, to march the army to London and subdue the Parliament; the petition was even prepared, which the army numerously signed, praying to be heard by the Parliament; and Charles had the incredible folly to countersign it, but retracted before it could be acted upon, instead of keeping aloof from the movement until it could be successfully executed. But in the *third* place, and which more than all the rest hurried on matters to extremities, he took the insane step of entering in person the House of Commons, and claiming the surrender of five members, the leaders of the party opposed to him, but who had the whole Commons and nearly the whole Lords for their followers. He had the day before desired the Attorney-General to prosecute them and a popular Peer for high treason, the charge being grounded on their Parliamentary conduct, in which they had all the Parliament for their accomplices. Even Mr. Hume, the staunch apologist of Charles and all the Stuarts, treats this step as an indiscretion beyond "the fondest wish of his enemies;" as a course entered on "without concert, deliberation, or reflection;" as an act "the prudence of which nobody pretended to justify," (Chap lv.) Lord Clarendon confesses that this unwarrantable and infatuated act alienated the generality of those who were beginning to judge more favourably of Charles, probably alarmed by the growing violence of the Parliamentary proceedings. Dr. Lingard, who repays the favour of the Stuarts towards his Church by extreme partiality for them, admits it to have been a proceeding equally blamed by his friends and his enemies. That it led immediately to the vote which vested in Parliament the nomination of the Militia officers,—in other words, the command of the army,—cannot be doubted; and this was the commencement of the Civil War.

It is wholly beside the design of this work to follow the history of the great events which that war produced, or to contemplate the extraordinary display both of civil and military genius by which it was marked. A revolution which unsettled the whole frame of the State, and changed in almost all particulars the established order of things, could not fail to force, as in a hotbed, the talents and the virtues, as well as the vices and the weaknesses, which peaceful times and regular government either nip in the bud, or stint in their growth, or cast into the shade, when they chance to attain maturity. But it is equally certain that in England, as in France a century and a half later, a vast majority of the people were averse to the change which overthrew the monarchy; that the republican party, utterly inconsiderable at first, was always a much smaller minority than in France; that the extremities to which the leaders went against the King found very few supporters among the people, and were disapproved by a majority of the Parliament itself, from which a military force in one day expelled two hundred of its members, leaving the minority in possession; and that the influence of the two most powerful motives which can affect the conduct of nations, religious fanaticism and terror, was required to make those violent proceedings be patiently borne. The hatred of the Church abuses in France supplied there the place of that fanaticism, and the terror was exercised in a much greater excess. But in both revolutions the success of a party was secured by

similar means; and in both the indolence and timidity of the well-disposed enabled the enemies of the people to prevail. The same moral is to be drawn from both these sad tales alike. It teaches all men that he who permits injustice and cruelty to triumph, when by doing his duty to his neighbour he could defeat them, shares the guilt though he may not share the spoil; and that the risk of being overpowered in the struggle for right is not such an excuse for inaction as can satisfy any but the most callous feelings and the most easy conscience.

The abolition of Monarchy was complete. It was declared treason to give any one the title of King without Act of Parliament—the House of Lords, as well as the Crown, was set aside—and the supreme power, legislative as well as executive, remained vested in the House of Commons, now attended by less than a hundred members, and wholly under the influence of the army. A council of forty-one—three-fourths of whom were members of the House—was appointed for a year to preserve the peace, dispose of the forces, naval and military, and represent the country with foreign states. A new seal, representing the Commons, was made, and entrusted to three Commissioners; and an oath to be true to the Commonwealth was directed to be taken by all persons in office. Half the Judges took it; the others resigned. The former made it a condition that Parliament would engage to maintain the fundamental laws of the realm. To this the House agreed; and the Judges never seem to have reflected that the Kingly power runs through all the jurisprudence of England, from the foundation upwards. New writs were issued to fill up vacancies which had reduced the Commons to a seventh of their number, and 150 at length were found to compose the House; but it was seldom that fifty could be got to attend, and hardly ever 100. Five or six eminent loyalists were tried and executed, but the reign of the Commonwealth was little stained with blood. Their puritanical rigour made them denounce severe penalties against offences which no penal law can ever well or safely reach; Acts were passed punishing incest and adultery with death, and fornication with three months imprisonment—Acts, the severity of which, as might easily be foreseen, prevented their execution. But the public prayer for general reformation of the law was attentively listened to; and an important commencement was made of amendment in the system and in the practice of our jurisprudence. A full inquiry was instituted into financial abuses and frauds upon the revenue, especially in the management of forfeited estates. These must have been of importance, as in one year (1651) seventy individuals, chiefly of rank and fortune, were forfeited for their adherence to the King. The year after, previous to the fatal battle of Worcester, which extinguished the hopes of Charles II., his followers were also attainted; 71 first, and then 682 were thus punished; all, however, being suffered to redeem at one-third of their value. The Catholics were persecuted, but only one suffered death. The Presbyterians had been far worse persecutors than the Independents, insisting on uniformity of worship. But the Independents showed fully as much rapacity; and it was reckoned that the income of Catholics in the hands of sequestrators amounted to above £60,000 a year, though only two-thirds of England were included in this calculation. The rigour of their measures was not confined to the rich and noble; their violence descended to artizans, peasants, and menial servants.

The Long Parliament had naturally become unpopular, both from its duration of eighteen years, from the expulsion of a large portion of its members, and from its subserviency to the army and their chiefs. Cromwell's usurpation, therefore, was acceptable to the nation; but he had little other hold over the people than what their dislike of Parliament and the dread of his military power gave him. He collected about 120 men of puritanical and sanctified habits, chosen by himself from a greater number returned by different congregations, and to them he entrusted the whole government. This ghostly body (commonly called Barebones' Parliament), how ridiculous soever in many of its proceedings, showed no little wisdom in prosecuting several important reforms, and correcting some glaring abuses; it also showed some disposition towards independence in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it. This, of course, displeased Cromwell; and on dissolving the body, and taking upon him the executive government, under the title of Protector, as tendered to him by a party of its members, he proclaimed the Instrument of Government in forty-two articles, vesting the legislative power in the Protector and Parliament,—no dissolution of which could take place, without its own consent, in less than five months. The Protector had the command of the army and navy; the power of making peace and war, with his council's consent; the power of appointing the great officers of State, with consent of Parliament; and the successors of the Protector were to be named by the Council. The Parliament consisted of 460 members, chosen by the larger boroughs, exercising their former rights of election, and in counties by persons possessed of £200 in any kind of property: 400 were for England, 30 for Scotland, and as many for Ireland. It met; and finding, after five months' trial, that the

members were far from being very pliable to his wishes, he dissolved it, and alarmed by a royalist movement in the west, delivered over the kingdom to eleven Major-Generals for as many districts, who were commissioned to levy a tax of ten per cent., which he imposed on all royalists. He also continued a duty on merchandise beyond the time limited by law. Some refusing to pay this illegal impost were fined by the collectors, and sued them for damages. The Judges showed their wonted subserviency and pusillanimity, and Cromwell sent to the Tower the counsel for one party who sued. He also erected a High Court of Justice, by which several of his adversaries were condemned to death, and suffered accordingly. The Government was now a military despotism, and it is certain that nothing but Cromwell's brilliant success in all his foreign expeditions, and the dread of the Stuart family being restored, could have maintained him on his usurped throne.

After an interval of about two years he was obliged to call another Parliament; the Scotch and Irish members were submissively obsequious; the English so little disposed to obedience that he previously examined the returns, and by an act of violence excluded about ninety of them on pretence of their immorality. No one was suffered to enter the House, guarded by his sentinels, but those who had a certificate from his Council. The result was an obsequious assembly, which addressed him to take the title of King, and agreed to many amendments on the Instrument of government. He refused the Crown, as is well known; but the amendments of the Instrument gave him the power of naming his successor, and of naming an Upper House of not more than seventy, nor less than forty members. In virtue of this sixty-two members of the Lower were summoned to the Upper House. The removal of his principal supporters from the Commons weakened his influence in that House, and he was soon obliged to dissolve this Parliament,—the fourth that he had so dismissed, and the last he ever called.

It has sometimes been considered by historians that the first form of government under the Protector, that of the Instrument, was republican; and the second, under the Petition and Advice, was monarchical; and Mr. Hallam is of this opinion. But except in the power of naming his successor, and the institution of the Upper House, the first was really as monarchical as the second. The Protector's death, and his son Richard's incapacity to hold his office, led, after an interval of eighteen months, during which the Government was at one time in the hands of a Council of general officers, to the restoration of Charles II., without any security whatever being taken for his constitutionally governing the kingdom, beyond the effect which his father's fate and his own sufferings might be expected to produce upon his mind.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS—THE REVOLUTION.

THE history of the Constitution from the Restoration to the Revolution, although usually viewed as divided into two portions,—the proceedings of Charles II. and those of James II.,—is in fact properly to be considered as one and the same; the course of events being uninterrupted, the proceeding of all parties being the same, and the conduct of the brothers only varying in the accelerated pace with which the more honest and bigoted of the two hurried matters to a crisis. The only real difference in the two reigns is, indeed, to be found in the personal characters of those Princes; the one indolent, careless, unprincipled, loving his ease rather than anxious about power, unless as it might secure him from interference with his pleasures, or save him from the equally ungrateful interruptions of business; not at all envying others their freedom, so he might only enjoy his own;—the other a stern ruler, jealous of his prerogative, from religious as well as political principle; a furious bigot from conviction; little averse to labour, and fearing no risk in the pursuit of his object; ever ready to sacrifice a temporal to an eternal crown; and though affecting much regard for his word, yet unscrupulous of breaking it when its strict observance stood in the way of his predominant passion. Though in religion Charles had gradually become a Romanist, he never was prepared to avow his conversion, or to make any sacrifice for his faith; his religious principles hanging almost as loosely about him as his moral. But James, though a rigid devotee, confined his self-restraint to matters of faith and the promotion of his Church—having led at all times the same licentious life with which his brother and the rest of the Cavaliers, combining party feeling and personal indulgence, had debauched the English morals and outraged the feelings of the puritanical classes, even after their restoration to power.

It not only little suited Charles's habits to risk what he termed "going again on his travels," in order to battle for Prerogative and Popery, as James would have had him do; but he even would himself have preferred ruling by Parliaments as the easier course

to pursue, could he only have found them reasonably tractable. He had no mind, as he told Lord Essex, to sit like a Turk and order men to be bow-stringed; but then he "would not have a set of fellows spying and inquiring into all his proceedings,"—and of some laws which he found established he openly avowed his detestation, declaring, for example, that he never would suffer any Parliament to be assembled under the famous Triennial Act of 1641. This was accordingly repealed. Still he tried how far he could go on amicably with such assemblies; and it was only when he found they refused him money, and would inquire into the public conduct of his Ministers, that he threw himself into the arms of France, made his power and influence wholly subservient to the profligate ambition of Louis XIV., received regular supplies of money from him to evade the necessity of meeting his people's representatives, bartered for this price at once the honour and the policy of the country, and entered into a shameless conspiracy both against the liberties of Protestant Europe and the free Constitution of his own kingdom. It is manifest that had the English Patriots in 1670 been apprised of his proceedings, the Revolution never ought to have been delayed an hour. The calling in of William at that time would have been on every principle equally justifiable; and the expulsion of the restored family would have been an act still more necessary for saving both the liberties of Englishmen and the independence of their country; for that which James's proceedings never even threatened was absolutely sacrificed by Charles—the national security as against France.

For a long time doubts were entertained by many, and affected by some, of Charles's criminality; nor were these wholly removed until the publication of a secret treaty entered into with Louis XIV. in 1669, made all further denial of the conspiracy impossible. He thereby stipulated for a regular pension of £200,000 a year, equal in value to half a million at the present day, and 6,000 men. In return for these means of both governing without Parliament and overpowering all resistance from his subjects, he became party to a plan of partition upon a scale not exceeded by the northern powers in the case of Poland a century later, and to whom indeed these infamous transactions may well be considered as having served for a model. France was to seize the larger portion of the United Provinces, while England should have the greater part of Zealand, with Ostend, Minorca, and part of the Spanish provinces in South America; a Bourbon prince occupying the Spanish throne, and abandoning part of the Spanish empire as the price of his quiet possession. It is worthy of observation, as fixing upon Louis XIV. still more incontestably the invention of the Partitioning system, that he had twice, three years before, entered into a similar scheme with the Emperor for dividing the Spanish dominions. The inequality of the conditions had made the Emperor abandon this notable project; he perceived plainly enough that while Louis was to occupy the Peninsula and the Dutch provinces at his ease, the Emperor would have no part of the spoil that he did not win by force of arms.

It was certainly fortunate for this country that the suspicions raised in Louis's mind by the vacillating conduct and apparent bad faith of Charles, prevented the prompt performance of the conditions thus entered into. Had a well-appointed French army entered England, while abundant supplies of money supported the tyrant, he had only to keep on gratifying the Established Church with means of oppression towards the Dissenters, and to remain wholly inactive in his support of the Catholics, and his work of usurpation was complete. The abominable acts excluding all Nonconformists from corporations, and preventing them from ever coming within five miles of any corporate town, had won prodigious favour in the eyes of the clergy; and Charles had no such bigoted zeal for the religion which he secretly had embraced, or rather which he was in the course of adopting, as to risk "going upon his travels again," by giving it open and offensive protection. Add to this, that he had shown a truly regal facility of abandoning his oldest and ablest servants when Clarendon was impeached, suffering him to be declared guilty of treasons which he never had committed, because he timidly or prudently fled from an accusation of high misdemeanors of which he was undeniably guilty. His sending persons to remote and even foreign prisons, where they lingered without a trial for years until his fall; his accession to the French Alliance; and his procuring for Charles pecuniary supplies to preclude the necessity of meeting Parliament,—were crimes of a deep dye, how little soever they could give his profligate and ungrateful master a pretext for leaving him to his fate. His detestable conduct on the occasion of his daughter's marriage, when he besought the King to refuse his consent, and declared he had rather she were treated as a strumpet, or put to death for a conspiracy against the prerogative, than that the Crown were sullied by such an alliance, though it be an offence incomparably less heinous to the State, has, more than all his other crimes, fixed upon his memory the just scorn of all good men in after-ages.

In carrying on his Government two things were to be remarked of Charles, in both of which he differed

extremely from his brother, and accordingly prevented the Revolution from taking place in his time, towards which, however, all things manifestly tended. He showed much address and temper in avoiding difficulties which he seldom if ever met in front or endeavoured by force to surmount; and he displayed no obstinacy nor even firmness in the pursuit of objects which so careless and self-indulgent a nature little regarded. Thus, although it cannot be supposed that he gave implicit credit to the Popish Plot, and most likely disbelieved it altogether, he yet contrived to keep a certain neutrality through the whole of the excitement into which it threw the nation, and was able to take advantage of the re-action which succeeded when the wretches who had deceived the people so successfully, pushed their attempts a step too far, and accused those connected with the Royal Family. But his want of steadiness was apparent when, after issuing his declaration suspending the penal laws on the assumption of a prerogative to legislate absolutely in ecclesiastical matters, he was fain to withdraw it upon the anxious remonstrance of the Commons, alarmed, perhaps, more for their religion than their liberties. The extreme unpopularity of the Duke of York on account of his religion had given rise to a bill for excluding him from the succession. Charles used all his influence against it, and succeeded in throwing it out when it came to the House of Lords. The Duke himself was fully resolved, had it passed, to have tried even the desperate extremity of civil war rather than submit to the law; declaring to Barillon, the French Ambassador, that there remained no other means but this of restoring the Royal authority in England. Yet so bent upon taking security against his bigotry were even those who chiefly opposed the Exclusion Bill, like Halifax, that they framed as a substitute for it another bill which entirely changed the form of the Government, providing that, on a Catholic succeeding, the veto upon bills should cease, all civil and military offices be bestowed by Parliament, and a Committee of both Houses sit during the prorogation. It may further be cited as a proof of the excess to which Anti-Catholic alarm was carried, that, early in 1680, the Commons passed a unanimous resolution, declaring the Fire of London to have been the work of Papists, with a design of destroying the Protestant religion; and excluding from a seat every papist who should accept any office under the Crown.

In the whole history of human weakness there is no parallel to be found for the sudden change which speedily after came over the nation and its representatives. Whether the extremities to which they had been carried during the plot, or the violence which had been shown against the Duke of York, or the natural alternations of fickle and ill-informed men composing the multitude of all nations, or the shameful zeal displayed by the Established Church in vituperating the conduct of the late Parliament, or a part of all these circumstances, be the reason, certain is the fact, that hardly had the session closed when from one end of the island to the other there burst a cry loud and continual against all that the Parliament had done; and an universal disposition was disclosed to suffer whatever assaults upon liberty the prerogative of the Crown might make. The corporation of London, threatened with disfranchisement by a *quo warranto* issued against its charter, and aware of the habitual subserviency of the Judges, was glad to accept any terms that were offered, and submitted absolutely to the dictation of the Crown. The same base and pernicious example was followed in the other corporate towns. The late King's death in the bosom of the Romish Church, and the ostentatious display of his religion by James going openly to mass in Royal state, failed to open men's eyes and alarm their religious fears. He ventured early upon calling a Parliament, and a revenue of £2,000,000, equal to £5,000,000 at this day, was settled on him for life, with £700,000 a year for supporting a standing army. An address on behalf of the Penal Laws was altered on a suggestion that its expressions might give offence to the King. A bill passed one house at least, and that the people's House of Parliament, declaring it high treason to make any motion for altering the order of succession —the very house which a few years before had passed a bill to exclude the reigning monarch for ever, and bestow the Crown as if he had been naturally dead. It seemed a most superfluous plan which the profligate Sunderland had formed to dissolve the Parliament during the King's life, and trust to supplies from France in case any extraordinary occasion for them should arise. James, so lately the object of all men's dread and aversion, was now extolled for his courage, his adherence to his promises, his patriotic services to the country, his patience under the late persecution, which had forced him to reside abroad; so that he became now, to use Lord Lonsdale's expression, "the very darling of all men."

Meanwhile, notwithstanding his promise to rule constitutionally, and his pluming himself on being a man of his word, he began his reign by declaring permanent the customs which had been voted for a fixed time. He assumed the power of dispensing with the penal laws, and issued a "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience" on that ground, taking care all the while to gratify at once his own monarchical dislike of the

Nonconformists and the Church's prejudice against that body, by joining in severely persecuting them. In Scotland, where the Crown's prerogative was always more restricted than in England, he suspended the penal laws, as he stated, "by virtue of his sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power, to be obeyed without reserve by all subjects;" and for these acts the whole country, both counties and towns, poured in their warmest addresses of thanks. The gratitude of the Spanish mob, actuated by their priests and fired with superstition, was never in our own day more eagerly displayed for the restored blessings of despotic government than was that of the English people, in 1686 and 1687, for the arbitrary rule of James II.

Now, above all, was exhibited the base sycophancy of the lawyers, rendered more disgusting by the learned garb in which it clothed the vile language of crouching slaves; their subserviency the more glaring as it was the more pernicious and the more infamous in the more elevated positions of the profession. Now were seen the Benchers of the Middle Temple first hailing with delight the earliest act of the tyrant's reign, his levying money without consent of Parliament,—for which wholesome exercise of the prerogative those sages of the law humbly and heartily tendered him their thanks. Again, the raptures of the same vile body knew no bounds when James, himself, spurning all bounds, assumed the full dispensing and suspending powers. They averred that the Royal prerogative is the very life of the law, gratefully thanked him for asserting it, declared it to be given by God, and beyond the power of any human tribunal or authority to limit, and vowed to defend with their lives and their fortunes the grand truth, *a Deo rex—a rege lex*. Then, too, were seen the whole twelve judges, save only one, declaring the right of the King to dispense with penal statutes, most solemnly made for the purpose of restraining his power; a Pemberton wresting the rules of evidence, to the sacrifice of innocent persons hateful to the Court; a Jefferies campaigning in the north against all corporate rights, in the west against all dissenters from the doctrines favoured by the Prince, and causing streams of the purest and most innocent blood in the land to dye its furrows, that he might do his profligate employer's butchery, pave the way for absolute monarchy, help the overthrow of the national religion, and meanwhile provide convicts to be spared by redeeming their lives or their exile with money to meet the cravings of a profligate and insatiable Court. A Parliament, however, seemed still wanting to give the Catholics their establishment in the form of law; and to prepare for this, Regulators of Corporations were commissioned to examine all their titles and all their acts, and to new model their structure under the threat, amounting to inevitable certainty, of judicial sentence if they resisted.

Happily the moonstricken Prince had gone a step too far. He had done in a month or two what, if a year or two had been consumed in doing, might have been unresisted. He had expelled the members of one college for being Protestants, named a Catholic principal of another, and prosecuted seven Prelates for representing against his Declaration appointed to be read in all Churches. The Church had mainly been the cause of his excesses. The declarations of the University of Oxford some years back, against all freedom of discussion and in favour of absolute government, followed up by their slavish submission at his accession, and the zeal with which the clergy had everywhere taken his part, running down all his opponents, and especially the Protestant Parliament last held in his brother's reign, had not unnaturally induced him to believe that he might rely on their neutrality, if not on their help, in all his designs. In truth, he had persuaded himself that there was no substantial difference between his faith and their's; for he had been entirely converted to Romanism by reading the controversial writings of the English Divines in the school of Laud; and it must be admitted that, like a certain sect of the Anglican clergy in our own day, the bounds which separated that school from Romanism were very difficult to descry. However, he reckoned on their adherence in vain. Suddenly Oxford led the way in deserting him, as she had led the way in seducing him. The communication had now been opened with the Prince of Orange. James saw that he must fight for his crown; and though he prepared himself by the measure of drafting a great number of Irishmen into his army, men prepared to fight for any cause or any person, the precaution was taken too late; the Bishops were acquitted, even the Judges now venturing to do their duty; the army refused to quit the Church; the clergy rallied in defence of their benefices, and their pulpits, and their faith; the country declared generally against the King, and for the Prince. A convention first, then a Parliament, after much subtle discussion, declared the throne vacant, and setting aside James's children, as well as himself, except the two Princesses, Mary and Anne, who had gone over to his enemies, settled the succession to the Crown upon William and upon them; and it was afterwards further limited to the descendants of James I.'s daughter, married to the Elector Palatine. This Revolutionary arrangement, grounded entirely

upon the will of the people in a state of resistance to their hereditary rulers, is the whole foundation of the title by which the House of Brunswick now enjoys the crown. Cavils have sometimes been attempted, as if there had been no actual resistance in 1689; but they are only worthy of those antiquaries who deny a conquest in 1066, and read conqueror, acquirer. There had been arms taken in almost all parts of the country; but especially, and on a large scale, in Yorkshire, Notts, and Cheshire. There was a foreign army in the country, for no other purpose than to put down all attempts on the King's side; his troops for the most part joined the Prince; and by resistance to James he was deposed.

The form of words used, out of regard to tender consciences and legal niceties, in the Acts of the Convention offering the vacant throne, and of the Parliament offering the sovereignty for William and Mary's acceptance, is wholly immaterial. The Abdication was known and felt by every one to be constructive, not actual; James was well understood to have returned to London as King, and never by any act or word to have resigned the Royal authority which he claimed by hereditary title. But the people had rejected him; and their representatives held him to have vacated the throne, because he had been guilty of acts which justified them in deposing him. Moreover, suppose he had formerly abdicated, he could not prejudice his son's title to succeed upon the vacancy which his resignation made. But the same power—the will and voice of the people—which had pronounced the throne vacant in spite of James, set aside the title of his son; called to the succession William, who stood five or six off, and by the course of nature could not easily have hoped to succeed; and then made the Crown hereditary in the daughters of James, living his son, and afterwards limited it to a remote branch, excluding that son's issue.

Nothing can be more clear, therefore, than that the whole proceeding was revolutionary; that the change was effected by the Resistance of the people to their sovereign; that his assent was neither obtained nor asked, nor in any way regarded; and that the supreme power having been forcibly seized by the nation, was used to install a new chief magistrate in the throne. It must, however, be carefully kept in mind that the constitution thus preserved was not in any material respect altered; and that even in the manner of providing for its endurance, as little departure as possible was made from the established system, including the order of succession.

THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND SINCE THE REVOLUTION.

The National Resistance was not only, in point of Historical fact, the cause of the Revolutionary settlement, it was the main foundation of that settlement; the structure of the government was made to rest upon the people's Right of Resistance as upon its corner-stone; and it is of incalculable importance that this never should be lost sight of. But it is of equal importance that we should ever bear in mind how essential to the preservation of the Constitution, thus established and secured, this principle of Resistance is; how necessary both for the governors and the governed it ever must be to regard the recourse to that extremity as always possible—an extremity, no doubt, and to be cautiously embraced as such, but still a remedy within the people's reach; a protection to which they can and will resort as often as their rulers make such a recourse necessary for self-defence.

The whole history of the Constitution, which we have been occupied in tracing from the earliest ages, abounds with proofs how easily absolute power may be exercised, and the rights of the people best secured by law be trampled upon, while the theory of a free Government remains unaltered; and all the institutions framed for the control of the executive government, and all the laws designed for the protection of the subject, continue as entire as at the moment they were first founded by the struggles of the people, and cemented by their labour or their blood. The thirty renewals of Magna Charta—the constant and almost unresisted invasions of the exclusive right of Parliament to levy taxes, by the Plantagenet Princes of the House of York—the base subserviency of the Parliament to the vindictive measures of parties, alternately successful, during the troublous times of the Lancaster line—the yet more vile submission of the same body to the first Tudors—their suffering arbitrary power to regain its pitch after it had been extirpated in the seventeenth century—the frightful lesson of distrust in Parliaments, and in all institutions and all laws, taught by the ease with which Charles II. governed almost without control, at the very period fixed upon by our best writers as that of the Constitution's greatest theoretical perfection—and, above all, the very narrow escape which this country had of absolute Monarchy, by the happy accident of James II. choosing to assail the religion of the people before he had destroyed their liberty, and making the Church his enemy, instead of using it as his willing and potent

ally against all civil liberty—these are such passages in the history of our government as may well teach us to distrust all mere Statutory securities; to remember that Judges, Parliaments, and Ministers, as well as Kings, are frail men, the sport of sordid propensities, or vain fears, or factious passions; and that the people never can be safe without a constant determination to resist unto the death as often as their rights are invaded.

The main security which our institutions afford, and that which will always render a recourse to the right of resistance less needful, must ever consist in the pure constitution of the Parliament—the extended basis of our popular representation. This is the great improvement which it has received since the Revolution. As long as the House of Commons continued to be chosen by a small portion of the community, and to be thus influenced by the feelings and the interests of that limited class only, the Government resembled more an Aristocracy, or at least, an Aristocratic Monarchy, than a Government mixed of the three pure kinds; little security was afforded for constant and equal regard to the good of all classes; and little security was provided against such a combination between the Crown and the Oligarchy as might entirely destroy even the name of a free Constitution. The increased influence of the Crown from large establishments, the result of the burdens left by expensive wars and of extended foreign conquests, seemed capable of undermining all the safeguards of popular liberty, and threatened to obliterate all the remains of free institutions, as soon as some bold and politic Prince should arise equal to the task of turning such an unhappy state of things to his own account. In 1831 and 1832 the Parliamentary constitution was placed upon a wider and a more secure basis; and although somewhat yet remains to be accomplished before we can justly affirm that all classes are duly represented in Parliament, assuredly we are no longer exposed to the same risks of seeing our liberties destroyed, and the same hazard of having to protect ourselves by resistance; nor can any one now deny that the democratic principle enters largely into the frame of our mixed monarchy. This great change is much more than sufficient to counterbalance all the increase of influence that has been acquired by the Crown since the Revolution, including the vexations which unavoidably attend the administration of our fiscal laws for the collection and protection of a vast revenue, and the creation of a numerous and important body, always averse to struggle even under the worst oppressions, and always the sure ally of power—I mean the vast and wealthy body of public creditors, whose security is bound up with the existing order of things.

The great virtue of the Constitution of England is the purity in which it recognizes and establishes the fundamental principle of all mixed governments—that the supreme power of the State being vested in several bodies, the consent of each is required to the performance of any legislative act; and that no change can be made in the laws, nor any addition to them, nor any act done affecting the lives, liberties, or property of the people, without the full and deliberate assent of each of the ruling powers. The ruling powers are three—the Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons: of whom the Lords represent themselves only, unless in so far as the Prelates may be supposed to represent the Clergy; and the Scotch Peers to represent, by election for the parliament, and the Irish, by election for life, the peerages of Scotland and Ireland respectively; the Commons represent their constituents, by whom they are for each parliament elected.

If it should seem an exception to the fundamental principle now laid down, that the Crown has the power of making peace and war, and of entering into treaties with foreign states—operations by which the welfare of the subject may be most materially affected—it is equally true that no war can possibly be continued without the full support of both Houses of Parliament; and that no peace concluded, or treaty made, can be binding, so as to affect any interests of the people, without their subsequent approval in Parliament. The Sovereign, therefore, never can enter into any war, or pursue any negotiation, without a positive certainty that the Parliament will assent to it and support the necessary operations, whether of hostility or of commercial regulations; and thus the only effect of this prerogative is to give due vigour and authority to the action of the Government in its intercourse with foreign powers and its care of the national defence.

It is, however, a more serious infringement of the fundamental principle if either of the three branches assumes, under any pretence, a power of acting without the concurrence of the other two, and without the sanction of any known general law to which the obedience of the people may be required. The several branches of the system have each at different times endeavoured to exceed this limited and balanced power, and to exercise alone a part of the supreme functions of government. The Crown long struggled with the Commons to be allowed the right of taxing; it assumed repeatedly the right to imprison individuals without bringing them to trial; it claimed the power of suspending laws or of dispensing with them at a

much later period, and exercised this at least in ecclesiastical matters, down to the period of the Revolution. The abandonment, or the prohibition by law, of these dangerous pretensions was the main victory of the people both in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the freedom of the Constitution was deemed to consist chiefly of the restraint under which the Sovereign was thus effectually laid. But the two Houses of Parliament, and more especially the Commons, have laid claim to certain privileges by no means consistent with the mixed nature of the Constitution, and repugnant to the liberty of the subject.

The judicial power exercised by the Lords as a supreme Court of Judicature in all matters of law, whether civil or criminal, and a Court of general appeal in all equity suits, has never been deemed inconsistent with the liberties of the people. If indeed it were exercised, as by the letter of the Constitution it should be, by the whole body of the Peers, in like manner as their legislative and political functions are, great abuse must ensue, and wide-spreading oppression must be the consequence. But the Peers very wisely have in practice abandoned this right, and left their whole judicial business in the hands of some five or six of their number, professional lawyers, who have filled, or continue to fill, the highest judicial offices in the State. There have only been two instances of the Peers at large interfering in such questions for the last hundred years; only one within the memory of the present generation, and that above fifty years ago.

Both Houses, however, claim to visit with severe punishment what are called contempts or breaches of their privileges,—the Commons by imprisonment during the session, the Lords by imprisonment for a time certain, and by fine. Nor would this be objected to if it were confined to cases of actual contempt and obstruction, as by refusal to obey their lawful orders issued in furtherance of the judicial proceedings of the Peers, or of the inquisitorial functions of the Commons, or of any matter without the compassing of which either House could not proceed to discharge its duties. No court, from the highest to the lowest, can exist for any useful purpose, if its proceedings may be interrupted by any unruly individual, or riotous mob, or if its members may with impunity be obstructed or threatened in the discharge of their duties; and it is absolutely necessary that such lawless conduct should be at once repressed by immediate punishment. But very different have been the powers of visiting contempts claimed by the two Houses, especially by the Commons' House of Parliament. They have punished summarily, as breaches of their privileges, acts which could in no way be construed into an obstruction of their functions, and which might most safely have been left to the ordinary visitation of the criminal law. We have in the course of the last two Chapters seen the latitude which they frequently assumed in classing whatever they disliked under the head of breach of privilege, and punishing it with extreme severity. In the time of James I., as we have seen, the Commons ordered a person who was charged only with having spoken disrespectfully of the Palatine, then an object of popular favour, to be led ignominiously in procession on horseback, with his head towards the tail of the beast, to be whipped from London to Westminster, to pay a fine of £5,000, and to be imprisoned for life; and all but the whipping was executed upon this unfortunate gentleman. In Charles I.'s time they habitually voted any act which displeased them a breach of their privileges. In order to reach an obnoxious individual, whatever he did was declared against their privileges; thus, to reach Archbishop Laud, all "new-fangled ceremonies in the Church service" were voted contempts of the House. The same inordinate assumption of power under the name of privilege was in the next reign not unfrequent. The persons of members' servants, too, were held as sacred as those of members themselves. Nay, down to a late period, the last year of George II.'s reign, there are instances of members preferring their complaint in questions of private right to the House, instead of trying the matter by actions at law; and of the House treating the assertion of adverse rights as breaches of its privileges, and punishing the parties accordingly. Even at this day a libel on the House is treated as a breach of its privileges, as if any possible injury or obstruction to its proceedings could arise from prosecuting this as the King prosecutes it, and as every other person in the realm prosecutes attacks on his character.

It is impossible to deny that this power assumed by the Houses of Parliament, and especially abused by the Lower House, is an infringement on the whole principles of the Constitution, and a great violation of all the ordinary rules which ought to regulate the administration of criminal justice. In the *first* place, the party wronged, or complaining of injury, not only institutes the trial without the intervention of a grand jury, but assumes to be the sole judge of the charge, to find the guilt, and to mete out the punishment.—*Secondly*, the proceeding is of the kind most abhorrent to our laws; for the party is called upon to confess or deny the charge, and if he refuse to criminate himself he is treated as guilty.—But *thirdly*, and

chiefly, he is tried, not by a general law, previously promulgated, and therefore well known to him whose duty it is to obey, but by an *ex post facto* law, a resolution passed by his accuser declaring the criminality of the act after it has been done. This appears to be quite intolerable. Any law, anyhow made, provided it be made calmly, and before the event occurs which it embraces, is far preferable to a law contrived and promulgated for the first time on the spur of the occasion, when the passions are heated by the offence done or alleged. If even an indifferent party, a court of justice, or a legislature, were to make the law by which the defence should, in one breath, be defined, and the accused convicted, the grievance would be intolerable of such an anomalous justice. But how incomparably worse is the justice of the party complaining, himself making the law by which his adversary is to be tried, and pronouncing the rule, and the conviction, and the punishment, at one and the same time? I say nothing of the manner in which this proceeding precludes the Royal prerogative of mercy; because possibly breach of privilege, whether actual or constructive, is a case which ought to be exempt from the protection of the Crown. But the other objections are quite sufficient to make all considerate persons—all who are not, like one great party in the State, carried away by an undistinguishing love of party supremacy, and disregard of all the rules that should regulate judicial proceedings—agree entirely with the very sound and judicious opinions on this important subject expressed in the resolutions of the Lords on the Aylesbury case in the year 1701. They declared that "neither House of Parliament hath any power, by any vote or declaration, to create to themselves any new privilege that is not warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament; that the Commons, by their late commitment of certain persons for prosecuting an action at law, under pretence that it was a breach of their privileges, have assumed to themselves a legislative power by pretending to attribute the force of law to their declaration, and have thereby, as far as in them lies, subjected the rights of Englishmen, and the freedom of their persons, to the arbitrary votes of the House of Commons."

In 1721 the Commons went yet farther, for they committed to Newgate the printer of a Jacobite paper, merely because it was a public libel, and without pretending even to declare it a breach of their privileges; so that, by the same rule, they might punish any person for any kind of misdemeanour, without judge or jury.

I sincerely wish that I could perceive in the more recent history of Parliament any disposition on the part of the Commons to recede from so untenable a pretension as the claim to declare at any time their privileges, and to add new chapters to their Criminal Code as new occasions arise. Not only did they commit Mr. Gale Jones to Newgate, on the flimsy and indeed ridiculous quibble that debating in a club a *question* concerning the parliamentary conduct of a member was in violation of the Bill of Rights, which forbids *questioning* in any court or place any member for his proceedings in Parliament (a provision plainly intended to prohibit all judicial proceedings or quasi-judicial proceedings against members for their Parliamentary conduct);—not only did they send Sir Francis Burdett, and a few years after Mr. Hobhouse, to prison for libels published against them, which the ordinary process of the law reached, and would have been quite sufficient to punish;—but they afterwards assumed in 1836, and defended in 1837, the power of publishing whatever attacks on individuals they might think fit, and of protecting their agents from all responsibility, civil or criminal, for the act;—a power never in modern times pretended to be exercised by the Crown, whose servants are responsible for all acts done by its orders. Upon the same memorable occasion they adopted a resolution reported by a committee charged to inquire into the matter, and in that resolution they asserted their unqualified right at all times to create new privileges, and denounce new acts as a breach of those privileges. So that as the law of Parliament now stands the two Houses are invested each with a separate and uncontrollable power of making laws as occasion may require, of grinding, as it were, a little new law as they want it, and to suit the particular cases which arise; nor is any limit but their own discretion assigned to this pretended right. It may be quite necessary to give them the right of removing, and of summarily preventing all obstructions; quite right to let them visit, and severely visit, all misrepresentations in public of their proceedings, which are only made publicly known by sufferance; but to give them anything like the power of several legislation and jurisdiction claimed by both Houses, must be an infringement of the Mixed Constitution of the English Government. It is in vain to deny the origin of this claim, and the motive for preferring it. They dare not trust to the ordinary administration of the criminal law; they dare not go before an impartial judge and indifferent jury; they dread the consequences of leaving the law to take its course; and therefore they must needs take it into their own hands, and at once make themselves party prosecuting, grand jury, petty jury, judge,

and even lawgiver, by one sentence forming the law, promulgating it, prosecuting for its violation, convicting the accused under it, he being their adversary, and sentencing him to suffer for the wrong done, or alleged to be done by him, to themselves.

Let us now shortly consider in what the Constitution of England consists, how its structure is preserved, and how its functions are performed, having generally surveyed the principles on which it rests, the sacred right of resistance, the separation and entire independence of its component parts, and the admission of the People as well as the Prince and the Peers to an equal share in its powers and prerogatives.

The whole Executive Power is lodged in the Sovereign; all the appointments to offices in the army and navy; all movements and disposition of those forces; all negotiation and treaty; the power of making war and restoring peace; the power to form or to break alliances; all nomination to offices, whether held for life or during pleasure; all superintendence over the administration of the civil and the criminal law; all confirmation or remission of sentences; all disbursements of the sums voted by Parliament; all are in the absolute and exclusive possession of the Crown. An ample revenue is allotted for the support of the Sovereign's dignity, not only in a becoming but in a splendid manner, and his family share in due proportion the same liberal provision. To which is added a sum, formerly unlimited, of late years restricted to £1,200 a-year, for the reward of merit, by way of gratuity or pension.

Such are the powers and prerogatives of the Crown; but they are necessarily subject to important limitations in their exercise. Thus the Sovereign can choose whom he pleases for his ministers, dismiss them when he pleases, and appoint whom he pleases to succeed them. But then if the Houses of Parliament refuse their confidence to the persons thus named, or require the return to office of those so removed, the Sovereign cannot avoid yielding, else they have the undoubted power of stopping the whole course of Government. So, too, if war is declared, or peace concluded, contrary to the opinion of Parliament, the Sovereign has no means of conducting either operation, and his own inclination must be abandoned. We have before seen at large how there is often a compromise effected between the conflicting branches of the Government; and how, to avoid a collision, each giving up a portion of its demands, the result of the combined movement which the machine of the State pursues is one partaking of the impulse which each has given to it.

If it cannot on any account be affirmed that the Sovereign has full and independent powers of action, so it cannot any more be affirmed that he is without power, and very considerable power, in the State. If he can find any eight or ten men in whom he reposes confidence, who are willing to serve him, and whom the Houses will not reject, he has the choice of those to whom the administration of affairs shall be confided. When he has obtained a ministry, on many important points they are likely to consult his opinion and wishes rather than bring matters to a collision with him. Many modifications of the measures of Parliament are likely to be adopted rather than come to a rupture with him. The vast patronage at the disposal of the Crown, and the great revenue allotted to meet the Sovereign's personal expenses and those of his family, are a source of individual influence which must arm him with great direct power. His opinions, if strongly entertained, like those of George III. on the American war and Catholic question—his wishes and feelings, if deeply entertained—are thus certain to exert a real influence upon the conduct of public affairs, and with even the most conflicting sentiments of the people and the Peers, secure a sensible weight to his views in the ultimate result. This is the spirit of the Constitution, which wills that the individual Monarch should not be a mere cipher, but a substantive part of the political system; and wills it as a check on the other branches of the system.

Of all the Sovereign's attributes none is more important than his independent and hereditary title; nor can a greater inroad be made upon the fundamental principles of the Constitution than the bringing this into any doubt or any jeopardy. Hence, in the event of his infancy, illness, or other incapacity, it is a serious defect in the system that no general law has provided for supplying his place; because this leaves the question to be discussed and debated each time that the Royal authority fails, and in the midst of all the passions sure to be engendered by the adherents of contending parties and the advocates of conflicting opinions. There can be no manner of doubt that Mr. Fox's opinions in 1788 were far more in accordance than those of Mr. Pitt with the spirit of a constitution which abhors all approach to election in the appointment of the Chief Magistrate. Yet that precedent, followed as it was by Mr. Perceval's ministry in 1811, in both instances, from the mere personal views of the parties and their hostility to the heir apparent, has established it as the rule of the Constitution that, in the event of the Sovereign's incapacity, the two Houses

of Parliament shall always legislate to choose the Regent and define his powers, as well as to provide for the custody of the King's person. This is a complete anomaly in our form of government, and it perpetuates the risk of the worst mischiefs arising as often as the incapacity occurs, by providing that the whole of the subject most exciting to all classes shall be discussed during the greatest heats which that excitement can kindle. Of the same Parliament which in its wisdom has declared itself the best judge in its own cause, and has resolved that the law of its privileges, the measure of its prerogative, shall be taken from occasional decisions made for the purpose of each case, it may be pronounced worthy, and in exact consistency, to refuse settling by a general law the manner of supplying any defects in the Royal authority, of preserving the prerogative of the Crown, and to leave the rule for special, and partial, and inflamed consideration as often as the incapacity occurs. As it has dealt with Parliamentary privilege, so has it dealt with Royal prerogative, according to the factious views of the hour, and with no regard for the well-being of the Constitution.

The most important check upon the Royal authority is the necessity of yearly meeting Parliament, and of having recourse to it for the means of carrying on the government. The power of the sword is really only given for a year to the Sovereign. The only means which he possesses of keeping the army and the navy together, and enforcing the strict discipline required, flow from an act passed yearly, and for a year each time. There are many branches of the revenue which in like manner are only granted for a year—in fact, all save that portion which is mortgaged to the public creditor. If, then, a King were to retain the troops on foot without a Mutiny Bill, and to levy the revenue not voted by Parliament, not only would the soldiery be released from obedience to their commanders, not only would the people be released from their allegiance, and justified in resisting the Crown, but the courts of law would refuse to aid the ministers by either suffering soldiers to be tried by courts-martial or requiring the subjects to pay their taxes. No soldier needs fear punishment for his disobedience, no person needs pay any of the taxes beyond those mortgaged to pay the interest of the national debt. Thus it becomes absolutely impossible for the Crown to govern without assembling a Parliament, or to govern without a general good understanding with the Parliament so assembled. Besides, whoever should remain in any office of trust under the Crown while illegal attempts were making, much more, whoever should join in making them, would, as soon as Parliament met, be impeached by one House and tried by the other; and although the Crown might pardon him, it could not prevent his trial and conviction.

Over the Parliament, thus essential to the administration of public affairs, the Sovereign no doubt has great influence. He can at any moment dissolve it, provided the Mutiny Bill is passed and the necessary supplies are granted; and thus, by appealing to the nation at large, he can defeat any factious cabal which an oligarchy not faithfully representing the body of the people might contrive for enslaving the Prince. There is even some risk of this power being abused, by the Royal influence being first employed to excite a popular clamour against particular men or particular measures, and then advantage being taken of such delusions in an immediate general election. The shortening of the duration of Parliaments affords the best security against this hazard; because, if the Parliament has only been assembled during a short period of time, the Sovereign is less likely to encounter another general election.

The Lords, who form the upper and permanent branch of the legislature, may be considered as representing not merely themselves, but also their powerful families and immediate connections, and in some sort as representing all the greater landowners in the country. We have shown how great a tendency the habits and the interests, and even the prejudices of this important assembly have to make it a conservative body, ever ready to fling its weight into the scale of the existing Constitution, and to prevent matters coming to extremities between the Crown and the people. Its veto upon all the measures that pass the Commons, the weight derived from its judicial functions, its general superiority in the capacity and learning required for excelling in debate, its more calm deliberation on all questions, unbiassed by mob clamour, its more statesmanlike views of both foreign and domestic policy, give the Upper House an extraordinary influence on all questions of national concernment. But to these sources of weight, the elements of the Natural Aristocracy, must be added the influence, and indeed the direct power, bestowed by vast possessions, as well as illustrious rank; and against this can only be set the popular connection of the other House, and its tenacious adherence to certain privileges with respect to the Lords. I allude particularly to the exclusion of the latter from the originating of any measure of supply, and from all alterations upon any financial measure sent up from the Lower House. Although the Lords have never abandoned their claim to originate and to alter money bills as well as the Commons, yet in practice

they never assert the right; and we may therefore take it, that by the practice of our Constitution the Commons alone can begin any measure of supply, and that the Lords have no power to alter it as sent up to them, but must either accept it wholly or wholly reject it.

It seems quite clear that this exclusive right of the Commons is wholly useless to them, while it greatly tends to impede public business, by loading the Commons with Bills which might be considered in the Lords while they have nothing else to do, and occasioning Bills to be thrown out in their last stages, and then introduced in the Commons and reconstructed, in order to meet objections taken in the Lords. That the Commons gain nothing whatever by this pretension is clear; and nothing can be more absurd than citing the case of the Upper House's judicial functions as a parallel one; for in that instance the Commons cannot interfere at all, the whole matter beginning and ending in the Lords; whereas the assent of the Lords to a money-clause is just as necessary as to any other part of a Bill. The claim is grounded on mere violent and factious excitement; on mere romantic and poetical declamation; on views consisting of exaggeration, of confounding things like as if they were identical; or on substituting one idea for another; or on a determination to act unreasonably and according to fancies and figures of speech, not solid arguments. It must be remarked, too, that the Commons, after treating this exclusive privilege as of paramount importance, as the safeguard of all its other privileges, have suffered it to be broken in upon once and again; as when it withdrew from the absurd pretence that a prohibition being enforced by a pecuniary penalty could not be touched by the Lords, because it was a money-clause.

Another point on which the Commons claim the exclusive right to begin measures relates to the election of its members. They hold that the House cannot part with this to any other body; and further, they will not suffer any Bill touching it to begin in the Lords. Yet nothing is more certain than that, as far back as 1770, they abandoned this exclusive right altogether, transferring the whole judicature touching elections from themselves to a Committee, authorized by an Act of Parliament, to which of course the assent of both King and Lords was absolutely necessary. It is equally certain that this and the subsequent statutory amendments of the Election Law have proved among the most useful, as they were among the most necessary improvements in the practice of the Constitution. Nor does any one now doubt that a further delegation of the judicial power in dealing with contested elections, such a delegation as should transfer it wholly from the Committees of the House to independent and impartial Judges, would be a still more valuable improvement in the constitution of Parliament.

No reasonable doubt can exist that the most perfect arrangement of the mutual rights of the two Houses would be that of entire equality; and that neither ought to have the exclusive right to originate or frame any law. In discussing certain measures there would naturally be a greater weight attached to one House than the other, a greater deference shown to its opinions, and a proportionable reluctance to reject its propositions. Thus the Commons, as representing the numbers of the community, as well as a portion of its wealth, would naturally be listened and deferred to upon all questions of public burdens, whether on the property or the labour of the people, and on all questions touching the elections of their members. The Lords would, in like manner, be more listened and deferred to on matters affecting the judicial system and the privileges of Peerage. Nor can it be reasonably doubted that this mutual deference would be far more surely and far more readily accorded by both Houses, if neither persisted in setting up claims so fanciful and so preposterous as those which we have been considering—claims inconsistent in themselves, and wholly repugnant to the fundamental principles of a Mixed Government.

The Crown is the fountain of honour, and can alone confer any rank or precedence. The unlimited power belongs to it of creating Peers; and of these no less than twenty-six, the prelates, enjoy their Peerage only for life. The power, indeed, exists of creating temporal Peers also for life; but it has never been exercised further than by calling up the eldest sons of Peers,—an operation which adds to the numbers of the House only during the lives of individuals. Twenty-eight Irish Peers sit by election for life, and sixteen Scotch during the parliament. The only restriction upon the power of creation refers to the Irish Peerage. No addition can be made to it in a greater proportion than that of one to every three peerages that become extinct.

This prerogative has upon several occasions been exercised to influence the proceedings in Parliament. Lord Oxford carried a question of importance in the Lords by a sudden creation of twelve peers, in the reign of Queen Anne. Mr. Pitt greatly extended the influence of the Crown in the House of Commons, and diminished the importance of that body, by transferring many of his adherents among the landed gentlemen to the Upper House. In recent times the

Government, of which I formed a part, backed by a large majority of the Commons and of the People out of doors, carried the Reform Bill through the Lords by the power which his late Majesty had conferred upon us of an unlimited creation of Peers at any stage of the measure. It was fortunate for the Constitution that the patriotism of the Peers, acting under the sage counsels of the Duke of Wellington, prevented us from having recourse to a measure so full of peril. I have always regarded it as the greatest escape which I ever made in the whole course of my public life. But were I called upon to name any measure on which the whole of a powerful party were most unanimously bent, nay, which attracted the warmest support of nearly the whole people, I should point at once to the measure of a large creation of Peers in 1831 and 1832. Nothing could possibly be more thoughtless than the view which they took of this important question. They never reflected for a moment upon the chance of their soon after differing with Lord Grey and myself, a thing which, however, speedily happened—never considered what must be the inevitable consequence of a difference between ourselves and the Commons—never took the trouble to ask what must happen if the Peers, thus become our partizans, should be found at variance with both King, Commons, and People—never stopped to foresee that, in order to defeat our oligarchy, a new and still larger creation must be required—and never opened their eyes to the inevitable ruin of the Constitution by the necessity thus imposed of adding eighty or a hundred to the Lords each time that the ministry was changed. I have seldom met with one person, of all the loud clamourers for a large creation of Peers, who did not admit that he was wrong when these things were calmly and plainly stated to him—these consequences set before his eyes. But I have often since asked myself the question, Whether or not, if no secession had taken place, and the Peers had persisted in really opposing the most important provisions of the Bill, we should have had recourse to the perilous creation? More than thirty years have now rolled over my head since the crisis of 1832: I speak very calmly on this, as on every political question whatever; and I cannot, with any confidence, answer it in the affirmative. When I went to Windsor with Lord Grey I had a list of eighty creations, framed upon the principle of making the least possible permanent addition to our House and to the Aristocracy, by calling up Peers' eldest sons; by choosing men without any families; by taking Scotch and Irish Peers. I had a strong feeling of the necessity of the case in the very peculiar circumstances we were placed in. But such was my deep sense of the dreadful consequences of the act, that I much question whether I should not have preferred running the risk of confusion that attended the loss of the Bill as it then stood; and I have a strong impression on my mind that my illustrious friend would have more than met me half-way in the determination to face that risk (and, of course, to face the clamours of the people, which would have cost us little) rather than expose the Constitution to so imminent a hazard of subversion. Had we taken this course, I feel quite assured of the patriotism that would have helped us, from the most distinguished of our political antagonists; and I have a firm belief that a large measure of reform would have been obtained by compromise—a measure which, however hateful at the moment to thoughtless, reckless men, become really more eager about the mode of obtaining it than about the object itself, would afterwards have proved satisfactory to all.—My opinion of Lord Grey's extreme repugnance to the course upon which we felt we were forced, has been more than confirmed by his letters since he read the above passage.*

We have now considered the House of Lords in its constitution and functions, composed of Spiritual and of Temporal Peers. The Prelates sit, and have

* The Duke always believed that our creation of Peers was a threat, or, as he called it, a "demonstration," and could not be persuaded that we should, if pressed, have recourse to it. Accordingly, when he saw my statement many years after, of the reluctance with which we contemplated that necessity, and that Lord Grey, upon my assertion to this effect being read to him, had declared that I stated it, as far as he was concerned, much below the truth, the Duke was greatly delighted, and said at Walmer Castle (where I always passed the last day with him, before crossing to Calais), "Then you now confess you were playing a game of brag with me?"—My answer, however, was, that he entirely mistook the thing, for that the creation was inevitable, had it become necessary; and certainly, when he, with his wonted sagacity and honesty, counselled the Secession, he showed that he had not so great a confidence in his estimate of our intentions as to run the risk. He was also greatly mistaken in supposing that our announcement in the Queen's case in 1820 was a mere threat. George IV. was in the same mistake; for though he well knew that we had proofs in our hands for recrimination, he never imagined what our recrimination involved—viz., his loss of the Crown by proof of his marriage with a Roman Catholic. In fact, I was clear that we should have the Bill thrown out in the Commons, if it ever went down from the Lords; but our fixed resolution was that it should not pass; and we determined to prove, if necessary, the marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, of which we were prepared with ample evidence, both of her kinsman at whose house it was celebrated, and if he should refuse deposing (by referring to the penalties of premunire), then we had the King's own letters, and his will written in his own hand, acknowledging her as his wife.

always had seats, in that House as Barons, each holding his see by the tenure of free-barony. But the Clergy, as a separate body in the State, had an assembly of their own, called the *Convocation*, summoned by the Archbishop's writ under the directions of the Crown. There was one for the province of York, which never was of any importance, and one for that of Canterbury. The Convocation consisted of the Bishops, who formed the Upper House; and the Deans and Archdeacons, proxies for the Chapters, and two for each diocese, elected by the Parochial Clergy; these formed the Lower House. The Convocation was hardly ever consulted except in granting a supply, and enacting Ecclesiastical Canons. In the reign of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, it was consulted on questions touching the religion of the State. Thus, in 1533, it approved the King's supremacy then enacted by law; and in 1562 it confirmed the Articles of Religion. However, by the Statutes made in Henry VIII. and Elizabeth's reign, and above all by the Act of Uniformity, in Charles II.'s time, the power of making canons without the King's leave was first taken from the Convocation; the Thirty-nine Articles, and the articles respecting residence, became fixed and incapable of alteration except by the Legislature; and the doctrine gradually became established in the Courts of Law that no canons whatever, unless confirmed by Parliament, could bind the Laity. Even the subsidies which the Convocation granted were confirmed by Parliament, and thus were assumed to be ineffectual of themselves. At length in 1664, the taxation of the Clergy in Convocation ceased altogether, since which time all classes of the people have been taxed in common by the Parliament. At the time of the Revolution, 1688, the Jacobites, for factious purposes, with the restless Atterbury at their head, before his flight and attainder, endeavoured to claim for the Convocation a right to meddle with Church questions; and some countenance was even given to those agitators by the Commons referring the form of the Liturgy for their consideration. The answer to all their arguments was the King's absolute power of adjourning and proroguing them, which he was free to exercise at all times, because he no longer had occasion for their votes to obtain supplies. In the early part of Queen Anne's reign the body was suffered to sit more than it had done for many years. It became notorious for violence of faction; it was soon, however, defeated by a prorogation; and since 1717 it has never sat for the transaction of any business whatever. Summoned as a matter of form at the beginning of each new Parliament, it is immediately prorogued as soon as it carries up an address to the Throne. The existence, therefore, of the Convocation is now nominal merely.

The Crown has the absolute power of appointing all the Judges, with the three exceptions of the Judges in the Ecclesiastical Courts, who are named by the Archbishops and Bishops; of the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities, who exercise a local jurisdiction over the students and tradesmen in the University towns; and of the Borough Magistrates, who exercise local jurisdiction by their Charters of Incorporation. It is greatly to be desired that such anomalies, especially the appointment of the Dean of the Arches and Judge of the Consistorial Court of London by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London respectively, should cease; and I must, in justice to these Right Reverend Prelates, observe that they were willing, in 1833, to give up this patronage if Parliament could have been induced to make a proper provision for those high legal offices. It must likewise be added that the patronage has never been abused, the most eminent practitioners in the Courts Christian being invariably chosen, as they ought, to fill such important places.

Though named by the Crown, care is taken to make the Common law Judges independent. Soon after the Revolution their places were made to continue during life or good behaviour; they are irremovable except by a joint address of the two Houses of Parliament; and as this only enables the Crown without compelling, each act of removal is like a statute, requiring the concurrence of the whole three branches of the Legislature. The power has never been exercised; and at the accession of George III. the judicial independence was rendered complete by providing that the office should not be vacated on a demise of the Crown. The highest of all the Judges, though only clothed with a civil jurisdiction, the Lord Chancellor, holds his place during pleasure. But the analogy of the Common Law Bench has been followed in the case of all the other Equity Judges—both the Master of the Rolls, the Vice-Chancellors, and the Masters in Chancery, holding their offices during life and good behaviour. The judicial Committee of the Privy Council is also placed in a somewhat anomalous position, although quite consistent with the fundamental principle which views the Sovereign as the authority appealed to in all Admiralty, all Consistorial, and all Colonial cases. The members of that High Court, therefore, though irremovable from their judicial stations out of the Council, may be removed from the Privy Council, and thus cease to form part of the Judicial Committee. It is, however, to be observed, that no emolument nor any rank is attached

to the place; and further, that no Privy Councillor is ever removed without grave reason for his removal. Nevertheless, it would be more satisfactory if some means could be devised of making these important judicial functionaries wholly independent of the Crown in name, as they undoubtedly are in fact.

An additional security is taken for the pure appointment of Judges by the very proper practice, now become established, of the Chancellor, who is in fact the Minister of Justice, appointing the Puisne Judges and the Chief Baron, without any communication with his colleagues: he first of all takes the King's pleasure upon the nomination. This excludes, generally speaking, all political interference; and it is greatly to be desired that the same high officer, and not the Secretary of State, should fill up the successive vacancies in the Scottish Bench. The important office of Justice of the Peace is conferred by the Chancellor, generally on the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant, or rather the *Custos Rotulorum* in each county. But once put in the Commission of the Peace, it is the ordinary practice not to remove any Justice without a conviction in a Court of Criminal Judicature.

The purity of the Bench is still further guarded by the statutory provisions disabling the Judges from sitting in the House of Commons. The Master of the Rolls and the Consistorial Judges are still exceptions to this rule. The Vice-Chancellors and the new Judges in Bankruptcy, the Judge of the Court of Admiralty and the Masters in Chancery, have all in later years been forbidden to sit in the Lower House. The chiefs are sometimes members of the House of Lords; and this is in a certain degree necessary for the perfect exercise of its judicial functions. But the feeling is so strong and so general against Judges mingling in the strife of political party, that we rarely have any example of these great legal dignitaries taking part in the struggles of faction.

If the other parts of the political fabric which we have been surveying are well entitled to great admiration, surely there is no portion of it more worthy of an affectionate veneration than the Judicial system. It is by very far the most pure of any that ever existed among men; its purity in modern times is not only beyond impeachment, but beyond all question. In the utmost violence of faction, in the wildest storms of popular discontent, when the Crown, the Church, the Peers, the Commons, were assailed with the most unmeasured violence, for the last century and upwards no whisper has been heard against the spotless purity of the ermine; or, if heard for an instant, it has been forthwith drowned in the indignant voice of reprobation from all parties, and has only served to destroy the credit of the reckless slanderer who emitted it.

The possession of such a system is invaluable to any nation; but in a free constitution, which requires large power to be lodged in the irresponsible hands of the people, it is absolutely essential to the existence of order in union with liberty. The Judicial power, pure and unsullied, calmly exercised amidst the uproar of contending parties by men removed above all contamination of faction, all participation in either its fury or its delusions, held alike independent of the Crown, the Parliament, and the multitude, and only to be shaken by the misconduct of those who wield it —forms a mighty zone which girds our social pyramid round about, connecting the loftier and narrower with the humbler and broader regions of the structure, binding the whole together, and repressing alike the encroachments and the petulance of any of its parts. When Montesquieu invented his epigram, so often cited since, that the fate of the British Constitution would be sealed whenever the Legislature became more corrupt than the Constituents, he overlooked a topic more fruitful of sound and valuable truth, if not easily lending itself to glittering figure; he might better have pronounced the Constitution eternal while the Judicial portion of it remained entire. There have been very great improvements in our Judicial system, of which I reckon that my institution of Local Courts (trying about 10,000 cases yearly), and my act for examining in all courts the parties to the suit, are the most valuable. But still, the great constitutional principle of the absolute independence of Judges holds the first place, and is the very greatest of our blessings.

Such then is the British Constitution—the slow growth of ages, which, if not its great virtue, is certainly the cause of its excellence. Laws are made; constitutions grow, at least if they are of any value; they have roots; they bear, they ripen, they endure. Those that are fashioned, resemble painted sticks planted in the ground, as I have seen in other countries what were called "*Trees of Liberty*;" they strike no root, bear no fruit, swiftly decay, and ere long perish. "Nature," indeed, as Bolingbroke says (beautifully translating a beautiful passage of Lord Bacon), "throws out altogether and at once the whole system of every tree, and the rudiments of all its parts, but she leaves the growth to time." Cherished by the breeze, strengthened by the sun, expanded by the shower (*mulcent aurœ, firmat sol, educat imber*). Such is the course of nature. But man

must work by another and a tentative process. Having to deal with human beings, he possesses no gift of foresight; he must consult the past and take experience for his guide, adding what has been found wanting, changing what has proved hurtful, removing what has been felt cumbrous. By this safe and gradual operation, our system has been formed in the course of ages; its progress occasionally slow, sometimes even for a season suspended; rarely sustaining any violent check; and so little broken by forcible concussion, that all the permanent improvements have been effected peacefully, and only short-lived changes have been the work of force. Thus it has happened that, while in other countries party contests have ended in revolutions, in this country, for about two centuries, we have had frequent changes of ministry, but no revolution, no change of dynasty.

The distinguishing characteristic of our Constitution is not confined to the manner and process of its formation. The felicity has indeed been inestimable of our having obtained its blessings without paying the price in public calamities and crimes. But the acquisitions we have made are greatly increased in value by the manner of making them. The structure is much better than if it had been formed in any other way. Even in providing a habitation, as well as in framing a constitution, comfort and convenience may be better secured by altering and improving a house already built and inhabited, than by raising one on an entirely new plan. The prudent thus find the risk little, the benefit great; while others erect fine mansions which they don't care to use, and give rise to the proverb that fools build houses for wise men to live in. So we feel the utmost confidence in all the principal parts of our system, because they are the result of actual experience, and of mutual concessions where a conflict of opposing parties has arisen. Indeed, as Mr. Burke somewhere observes, our whole history is the history of compromises and mutual concessions.

Thus there has been framed, and thus we possess the British Constitution—a combination of different interests and powers, at once providing against the encroachments of any one, and against error in the action of the whole; uniting in itself the characteristic qualities of all other governments, regal, patrician, republican; and endowed with their respective virtues; borrowing vigour from monarchy, stability from aristocracy, popular freedom from democracy. The people possess by their representatives a voice in the management of their own affairs, a real control over the conduct of their rulers, and a sensible weight in the selection of the public servants. The owners of property, the possessors of rank, and the representatives of all kinds of personal eminence, have a power and authority sufficient to check the excesses of popular violence. The Sovereign can influence the conduct of affairs as far as is compatible with the deliberate will of the other branches of the government. Above all, the unspeakable blessing of a pure and impartial administration of justice is secured by the absolute independence of the judges, and their exclusion from all share in party, or even in any political proceedings. The structure of the Constitution has been likened to a pyramid, of which the broad base supporting the whole is formed of the people; the middle portion is the aristocracy of rank, property, talents, and acquirements; and on the narrow summit rests the Crown. The judicial power, pure and unsullied, calmly exercised by men independent of all the other orders, and removed from all faction, partaking neither of its fury nor its delusions, forms a mighty zone, which girds the pyramid round about, connecting the loftier and narrower with the humbler and broader layers, binding the whole compactly together, and repressing the encroachments and smoothing the ruggedness of any of its parts. But the essential part of the aristocratical element must never be forgotten or overlooked. Nothing else can protect liberty from an arbitrary sovereign, or from the more insupportable tyranny of the multitude,—more insupportable, because pervading the whole community, while the single despot affects only certain classes. So deeply impressed with this truth are some sound friends of liberty, advocates of popular government, that they deem a landed aristocracy the indispensable condition of free constitutions. But whether one aristocracy alone can prevent the usurpation, both of an individual and of the multitude, our mixed monarchy is safe on either supposition. To admit that this great political structure has imperfections, or that into its administration abuses have found their way, is only to confess that it is the work of man, and by men administered; nor can any rational admiration which it calls forth be for a moment allowed to preclude further improvements, or be urged as a reason against considering fully any proposal conceived in a wise and reflecting spirit, and tending to amendment, not to subversion. But we are to regard in the first place the inestimable advantages which it at present secures to us, even if no further improvement be effected, and if none of the existing administrative abuses be removed. Thus, let it be granted that the representation is defective, and that classes are excluded whose ad-

mission is required both by considerations of justice and by the public interests. Still see what a prodigious benefit the existing state of things confers upon the people in their rights and their interests of every description! The business of the State is conducted in public; in public every matter is discussed by the two Houses; and there is hardly any restraint by law—certainly none whatever in practice—upon the complete discussion both at popular meetings and through the press. Then, beside the security of life, liberty, property, and reputation, under the law, every one can make his grievance known to Parliament and to the public—a protection which almost always prevents any just cause of complaint. Contrast the security from injury thus enjoyed by our fellow-citizens with the exposure to oppression and injury of various kinds of which the inhabitants of other countries complain—countries where there is no Parliament, no public meetings, no press, or, what is worse than none, a fettered, partial, corrupt press—and you will readily believe that the people of those countries would be glad to exchange their fine climate, fertile territory, and slight taxation, if they might, with our darker sky, reluctant soil, and heavy burthens, have a Parliament and a public which should make the sacrifice of their lives and fortunes to the caprice of a ruler and the malversation and oppression of his servants an impossibility.

ANGLO-SAXON AND DANISH MONARCHS.

MONARCHS.	Began to Reign.	Reigned Years.	MONARCHS.	Began to Reign.	Reigned Years.	MONARCHS.	Began to Reign.	Reigned Years.	MONARCHS.	Began to Reign.	Reigned Years.
	A.D.			A.D.			A.D.			A.D.	
Egbert	827	9	Edward the Elder	901	24	Edward the Martyr	975	3	Hardicanute	1039	2
Ethelwolf	836	21	Athelstan	925	16	Ethelred II.	978	37	Edward the Confessor	1041	25
Ethelbald	857	3	Edmund I.	941	4	Sweyn	1014	3			
Ethelbert	860	6	Edred	945	10	Edmund II.	1016	1	Harold II., son of Godwin, Earl of Kent	1066	1
Ethelred I.	866	6	Edwy	955	4	Canute	1017	18			
Alfred	871	30	Edgar	959	16	Harold I.	1035	4			

CONTEMPORARY MONARCHS OF ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND FRANCE

FROM THE CONQUEST TO THE PRESENT TIME.

ENGLISH.	Began to Reign.	TO WHOM MARRIED.	Reigned Years.	SCOTTISH.	Began to Reign.	FRENCH.	Began to Reign.
William I.	1066	Matilda of Flanders	21	Malcolm III.	1057	Philip I.	1060
William II.	1087	(Never married)	13	Donald Bane	1093		
				Duncan	1094		
				Donald Bane (restored)	1095		
				Edgar	1098		
Henry I.	1100	Matilda of Scotland	35	Alexander I.	1107	Louis VI.	1109
		Adela of Louvain					
Stephen	1135	Matilda of Boulogne	19	David I.	1124	Louis VII.	1137
Henry II.	1154	Eleanor of Guienne	34	Malcolm IV.	1153		
Richard I.	1189	Berengaria of Navarre	10	William the Lion	1165	Philip II.	1180
John	1199	Earl Montague's daught.	17	Alexander II.	1214		
		Avisa of Gloucester					
		Isabella of Angouleme					
Henry III.	1216	Eleanor of Provence	56	Alexander III.	1249	Louis VIII.	1223
						Louis IX.	1226
Edward I.	1272	Eleanor of Castille	35	Margaret	1286	Philip III.	1270
		Margaret of France					
				John Baliol	1292	Philip IV.	1285
Edward II.	1307	Isabella of France	19	Robert the Bruce	1306	Louis X.	1314
						Philip V.	1316
						Charles IV.	1322
Edward III.	1327	Philipa of Hainault	50	David II.	1329	Philip VI.	1328
						John	1350
						Charles V.	1364
Richard II.	1377	Ann of Luxembourg	22	Robert II.	1370	Charles VI.	1380
		Isabella of France					
				Robert III.	1390		
Henry IV.	1399	Mary Bohun	13	James I.	1406		
		Jane of Navarre					
Henry V.	1413	Katherine of France	10				
Henry VI.	1422	Margaret of Anjou	38	James II.	1437	Charles VII.	1422
Edward IV.	1461	Elizabeth Woodville	22	James III.	1460	Louis XI.	1461
Edward V.	1483	(Never married)	2 mos.			Charles VIII.	1483
Richard III.	1483	Ann Neville	2				
Henry VII.	1485	Elizabeth of York	23	James IV.	1488	Louis XII.	1498
Henry VIII.	1509	Katherine of Arragon	37	James V.	1513	Francis I.	1515
		A. Boleyn, J. Seymour.					
		Ann of Cleves, K. Howard					
		Katherine Parr					
Edward VI.	1547	(Never married)	6	Mary	1542	Henry II.	1547
Mary I.	1553	Philip, king of Spain	5				
Elizabeth	1558	(Never married)	44	James VI.	1567	Francis II.	1559
						Charles IX.	1560
						Henry III.	1574
						Henry IV.	1589
James I.	1603	Ann of Denmark	22			Louis XIII.	1610
Charles I.	1625	Henrietta of France	24				
Cromwell, Protector	1649					Louis XIV.	1643
Charles II.	1660	Catherine of Braganza	24				
James II.	1685	A. Hyde, Mary Mod.	4				
William and Mary	1689	Mary, dau. of James II.	13				
Anne	1702	Geo. prince of Denmark	12				
George I.	1714	Sophia of Zell	12			Louis XV.	1715
George II.	1727	Wilhelmina of Anspach	33				
George III.	1760	Charlotte of Meck. Strel.	60			Louis XVI.	1774
						Republic	1793
						Napoleon First Consul	1799
						Napoleon Emperor	1804
George IV.	1820	Caroline of Brunswick	10			Louis XVIII.	1814
William IV.	1830	Adelaide of Saxe Mein.	7			Charles X.	1825
Victoria	1837	Albert of Saxe Gotha				Louis Philippe	1830
						Republic	1848
						Napoleon III.	1852

THE

NATIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

CIVIL, MILITARY, AND DOMESTIC.

ROMAN PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

The Civil and Military History of Great Britain, from the Invasion of the Romans, B.C. 55, to the Saxon Period, A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

IF the early portions of Greek and Roman history are involved in obscurity, not less so are the early annals of the Britons. There can be no question that the beautiful island now called Britain had been the scene of many wars, revolutions, and other important events long before it began to figure in the historic page; but these events are either buried in oblivion, or the accounts given of them by the early chroniclers are so imperfect, improbable, and fabulous, that to perpetuate them would be labour in vain. Antiquarians have sought diligently to sift the fine gold of historic facts from the dross of fable, but all their efforts have proved fruitless. The result of their labours has only been to make "confusion worse confounded." Passing by, therefore, all traditionary tales, and all the comments of antiquarians thereon, concerning the remote inhabitants of Great Britain, we shall open our pages with the genuine story of our ancestry—a story that will be found in itself sufficiently romantic for the gratification of the most inquisitive reader.

The history of Britain commences with Cæsar. That renowned warrior of the Roman Republic having made great progress in the conquest of Gaul, cast the absorbing eye of ambition on our "sea-girt isle." He is said to have been prompted to form this design by the beauty and magnificence of its pearls, and its valuable productions of lead and tin, and to have been provoked thereto by the aid which some of the British tribes had given to their kindred race—his enemies in Gaul. It is certain that some of those tribes had fought most valiantly under the banners of their kindred; but the ruling motive of Cæsar in his invasion of Britain was doubtless a love of conquest and glory. For of all the warriors that Rome ever produced Julius Cæsar was perhaps the most ambitious. He was a conqueror who had no sooner subdued one nation than he turned his thoughts to the subjugation of another. Moreover, he hoped by his numerous and splendid achievements so to dazzle the eyes of his countrymen that he might be able to lay the proud Republic low; to convert it into an empire, of which he himself should be the first emperor.

The conquest of Britain, therefore, was to be one of the stepping-stones by which Cæsar designed to mount the imperial throne. At that time it was an unknown region to the Romans, and almost to all the rest of mankind. Even in later ages the Romans, according to one of their poets, considered "the Britons almost separated from the whole world." But the barrier of the ocean, by which our famous island is surrounded, was no obstacle to Cæsar's ambition. Ambition knows no bounds, and is undeterred by difficulties. If Hannibal crossed the Alps, which were then deemed to be

> "The barriers of a world
> Saying, Thus far, no farther,"

Cæsar could lead his legions across the Channel to Britain. But before he ventured on this enterprise, which was evidently considered to be of no ordinary character, he sought to obtain some knowledge of the coasts and state of the country he designed invading. He gathered around him a number of merchants who had traded with Britain, and questioned them concerning the number, power, and customs of the Britons, their art of war, and their harbours best fitted to receive his fleet. These merchants, however, do not appear to have been very communicative, for C. Volusenus was despatched with a galley to obtain the information he required by coasting round the island.

Meanwhile Cæsar marched with his legions into the territories of the Morini—the coast about Calais and Boulogne—where he collected a large fleet, that he might be ready to embark his legions. At this time the Britons had received notice of the impending storm from the merchants of Gaul. Ambassadors were sent by them to make their submission to the Roman power, and to offer hostages for their fidelity. That step was taken in the hope of averting the danger by which they were threatened; but that hope proved vain. Cæsar received the ambassadors with smooth words and fair speeches, and sent them back to Britain with many professions of friendship; but on the return of Volusenus his troops embarked for the enterprise. In order to deceive the Britons, when the ambassadors returned, he sent with them one Comius, a Gaul whom he had made king of the Atrebations—an ancient Belgic nation who inhabited Artois—whom he instructed to visit as many of the

British states as he could, and to persuade them to enter into an alliance with the Romans. Comius was also to announce to the British tribes that Cæsar intended shortly to visit them in person, not as an invader, but as a friend who sought their friendship. But the character of Cæsar appears to have been well known in Britain, and the Britons were not to be deceived. No sooner had they discovered that their ambassadors had failed to divert him from his expedition to their fair island than they resolved to arm for their defence. His envoy Comius, with his attendants, were made prisoners, and a numerous army was assembled on the sea-coast to meet the Roman legions.

It was at the latter end of August, B.C. 55, that Cæsar embarked his legions for the invasion of Britain. He appears to have sailed from Portus Itius, or Witstand, between Calais and Boulogne. A fair wind soon brought him within sight of the white cliffs of Dover. He had with him about twelve thousand men, all trained and well-disciplined: warriors such as only Rome at that period could produce. They were of the race who had contended with the most warlike nations of antiquity, and had brought them under Rome's dominion, and who for their high achievements in the dread art of war had gained a renown for invincibility. They were of the race that had destroyed Corinth, and the great rival republic, Carthage, and they had themselves reduced Gaul to submission. How, then, could the undisciplined and naked Britons hope to withstand them? Yet there they were looking from the lofty cliffs of Dover at the mighty fleet which was covered with these famous legions with an undaunted mien, and ready to engage them should they set foot on their native soil.

Even the great Cæsar dared not risk an engagement with the bold Britons at such a point. Turning his prows northward, therefore, he sailed about eight miles farther, and cast anchor opposite a plain and open shore, better fitted for the landing of his legions. The spot was somewhere between Walmer and Sandwich, and is generally supposed to be at or near Deal. But the Britons were there before him. They had watched his movements, and were ready to receive him. The beach was crowded with horses and chariots and infantry, a fierce throng, who howled their contempt of the invaders, and inflamed each other's courage with native songs of battle. For a time Cæsar's legions were appalled at the sight of their skin-clothed and painted enemies. At length, however, the standard-bearer of the tenth legion, having first invoked the gods of Rome, leaped from his galley into the sea, and advancing through the waves with the eagle, exclaimed, "Follow me, my fellow soldiers, unless you will betray the Roman eagle into the hands of the enemy; for my part I will discharge my duty to Cæsar and the commonwealth." This bold action, and animated speech, had their effect. From every galley they plunged into the sea, and after a fierce and bloody struggle in the waves with the Britons, who advanced to meet them, they effected a landing. The well-disciplined forces of Rome triumphed.

The Britons retired discouraged and dismayed. They sued for peace. Having released Comius, they sent him with their ambassadors, offering hostages and entire submission to their conqueror. Cæsar reproached them for the violation of their former engagements, but consented to grant them peace on condition that they would send him a certain number of hostages. Some of these hostages were sent, but the rest were only promised. They were to be delivered up as soon as they could be brought from the interior of the country. In the mean time an event occurred which encouraged the Britons to renew their hostilities. They had been defeated, but not conquered. Their courage was as indomitable and their contempt of the Romans as bitter as ever. When Cæsar sailed from Gaul with his legions of infantry he had left his cavalry behind, giving orders that they should follow him. His transports, with the cavalry on board, sailed on the day he had made peace with the Britons. A gentle gale wafted them from the Gallic shores, but as they approached the British coasts, and were within sight of the Roman camp, a storm arose, which drove them back to various ports on the continent. That same storm also placed the great Cæsar in the most imminent danger on the British island. He had drawn up his galleys on the strand, while his transports lay at anchor in the road, but its being full moon and spring tides, the violence of the storm filled his galleys with water, dashed many of his transports to pieces, and rendered the rest unfit for sailing.

Cæsar had no means left of returning to Gaul as he intended, and he was left in the midst of fierce tribes whose enmity he had so wantonly provoked. The Romans were dismayed at their position. On the other hand the Britons looked upon the wreck of his galleys and transports with secret satisfaction. They considered it to be their hour of vengeance. The army which had met the Romans on their landing had separated, but the skin-clad warriors were still at hand, and ready to re-assemble at the call of their chiefs. Some of those chiefs were in Cæsar's camp, and encouraged by the disaster which had befallen his fleet, and observing the small number of the Roman forces, and their want of corn and cavalry, they conceived that they might be able to destroy those forces, either by force or famine, and thus rid themselves of all fear of future invasion. Under various pretexts, therefore, they left the Roman camp, and again collected their followers to contest the palm of victory with the invincible legions of Rome.

As the promised hostages had not arrived, and the British chiefs had thus left his camp, Cæsar suspected treachery. In order, therefore, to provide against a surprise, he employed one part of his army in repairing his fleet, and the other in procuring corn for the camp. The harvest had been garnered except one field. In that field the seventh legion were one day cutting the corn, when on a sudden a host of British cavalry and chariots rushed upon them from the adjacent woods. Some of them were slain, and the rest would have shared their fate had not Cæsar, warned of their danger, hastened with two cohorts to their rescue. The Romans again prevailed; the Britons retreated, and Cæsar led his legions back to the camp. There was now another pause. The Romans were busied in repairing their ships: the Britons in collecting forces. Messengers were sent into all parts exhorting them to

assemble to destroy their invaders, and enrich themselves with the spoils of their camp. The call was obeyed. A great army of horse and foot approached to the attack; but Cæsar drew out his legions to meet his enemies, and once more disciplined valour triumphed over the ill-trained and badly armed Britons. Disheartened by this defeat, ambassadors were again sent to Cæsar to sue for peace, and the terms on which he granted it, coupled with his readiness to make peace, raises a suspicion that he was heartily tired of this bootless campaign. His conditions were simply that the Britons should give him double the number of hostages as pledges of their good faith, and these were to be sent *after* him into Gaul. As winter was now approaching, and his fleet was refitted with the final loss of only twelve ships, he set sail for Gaul. His expedition was extolled by his partisans at Rome as one of the most glorious and wonderful exploits ever performed by the Roman arms.

In reality, however, it was attended but with little honour, and with no permanent advantage. The Britons were not conquered, for they were not rendered tributary: that inevitable consequence of a Roman conquest. His own story of the cause of leaving Britain thus precipitately is simply that "the equinox was approaching, and his ships were leaky," but it is evident that he has suppressed some material circumstances. It is even doubtful that his victories were so decided as he represents them to have been, for it is certain that considerable numbers of his soldiers were cut off in his contests. So incomplete was his triumph in Britain, indeed, that only two of the British states sent hostages to him in Gaul: the others fearlessly committed a breach of treaty which gave him a plea for renewing his invasion in the year B.C. 54.

The winter was spent in preparing for this second expedition to Britain. A more formidable army was raised, and ships of a peculiar construction were built for the conveyance of his troops, especially his cavalry. They were lower, broader, and lighter than usual, so that they might draw less water and approach nearer the shore. It was in the spring of the year that he embarked; sailing from Portus Itius as before. This time his army consisted of five legions of infantry, and two thousand cavalry. He again landed on the flat shores of Kent, and this time he was not opposed. The Britons had prepared for resistance—for a strong confederacy had been formed—but dismayed at the mighty armament, they retired into the interior of the country. Cæsar went in pursuit of them. Leaving ten cohorts and three hundred horse to guard his fleet, he marched towards the interior with the rest of his army. Twelve hours' march brought him in sight of the confederated Britons. They were posted on rising ground behind a river, supposed to be the Stour, determined to dispute its passage. Of the number of British warriors thus assembled there is no account given: the Romans numbered about thirty thousand men. The passage of the river was gallantly disputed by the confederate army, but the Roman cavalry cleared the way, and the whole army passed over. The contest was evidently most unequal.

According to Cæsar's own account it was the inland people he was now fighting with: "men who for the most part sowed no corn, but lived on milk and flesh, and had skins for their clothing." The only wars in which such men had been engaged in were with adjacent tribes, and therefore they were ill fitted to contend with soldiers clad for the most part in armour, and trained from their youth up to the business of war. For the Roman soldier was not allowed to follow any other profession or business, but was compelled to follow that of arms until he had become too old for service. But it was as a body that the Roman soldiers were to be feared. Their discipline was severe; and the constitution of a Roman army was perfect. In a fragment of Arrian a description of that constitution is given, which may serve not only for this, but for any period of the empire.

He says:—"When drawn up in order of battle, the legions were placed in one line eight deep. . . The first four ranks were armed with the *pilum*, and the others with javelins. The men in the front rank were to present their pile at the level of the enemy's horses' breasts; and those in the second, third, and fourth ranks were to stand ready to throw theirs. A ninth rank was to consist of archers, and behind all were the catapultæ for projecting darts and arrows, and balistæ for throwing stones, over the heads of the men in front. The cavalry were directed to be in the rear of the legions, probably in the event of being obliged to quit their stations on the wings. On the enemy making a charge, the second and third ranks were to close up to the first, and all these were to present their pila: the men in the fourth rank were to throw their weapons directly forward, and those in the rear were to discharge theirs over the heads of the others." But it does not appear that the confederated Britons were attacked by this formidable phalanx. Arrian says that the march of a Roman army was always preceded by the Roman light cavalry in two ranks, and it would seem that the Britons were defeated by this cavalry before the legions were drawn up in their usual order of battle. Having crossed the river, no doubt Cæsar placed his soldiers in the order Arrian describes, but there was then no enemy on open ground to contend with. The Britons on being repulsed had retired to some adjacent woods.

It is evident that they were not altogether novices in the art of war. They had provided, at all events, for a safe retreat. On retreating before the victorious legions of Cæsar they took up a position in a place in the woods which was strongly fortified both by nature and art. In this fastness they lay for some time, occasionally sallying forth in small parties to harass the enemy. But they were not safe even in that fastness. Having cast up a mound the soldiers of the seventh legion advanced under cover of their shields, which were large enough to protect the whole body, forced the intrenchments, and drove the Britons from their fancied place of security. Dividing his army into three bodies, Cæsar sent them in pursuit of the confederates, but the trumpets had scarcely sounded the advance, when intelligence arrived that a storm had once more driven his fleet ashore on the Kentish coast, and dashed many of his ships in pieces.

Recalling his legions from the pursuit of the Bri-

tons, Cæsar retraced his steps to the sea-shore. Forty of his ships had been destroyed, and the rest so damaged as to be scarcely susceptible of repair. Every carpenter was set to work; others were sent for from Gaul; and orders were despatched to Labienus, his lieutenant in Gaul, to build new ships as quickly as possible for his service. As it became evident that



ROMAN GALLEY.

his ships were not safe in riding at anchor, Cæsar had all those that had escaped the wreck drawn up on shore and enclosed within his fortified camp. His army was employed in this herculean labour ten whole days; but no sooner was their work accomplished than Cæsar marched again in pursuit of the confederated Britons. By this time their numbers had been greatly increased, and, taught wisdom by experience, they had resolved not to meet the Romans again without having a skilful leader to lead them into battle. Their choice fell upon Cassivelaunus, chief of the Cassi, a people who inhabited part of Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, and Hants. Cassivelaunus had a reputation for skill and bravery. He was chief of one of the most warlike and powerful tribes of the confederacy. In this respect, therefore, the choice which the Britons had made of a commander was a prudent one; but unfortunately Cassivelaunus and his subjects had, before Cæsar's arrival, been almost constantly engaged in wars with some of those tribes over whom he was now called to command; the effect of which had a tendency to weaken their attachment to him, and to damage the common cause. Under their new leader, however, the confederated Britons awaited the shock of the Roman legions with undaunted courage.

On those legions came with the great Cæsar at their head, presenting an appearance of an impenetrable human wall. The Roman cavalry again marched in the van, and on their approach Cassivelaunus attacked them with his horse and chariots with the utmost fury. The Britons were repulsed, but the Romans pursuing with too much eagerness sustained considerable loss. This conflict appears to have been more of a skirmish than a real battle, and it is questionable whether the Romans had any claim to their vaunted victory. Some time after, indeed, a portion of their army suffered a signal defeat, for as they were fortifying their camp the Britons sallied out from their place of concealment in the woods, routed their advanced guard, and defeated two cohorts sent by Cæsar to rescue the guard from destruction. On this occasion the Britons retired without loss; but on the following day, as they again sallied from the woods to attack the Romans, they were met with such order and firmness by both horse and foot that they suffered a signal overthrow. By the issue of this day's battle the confederacy of the British states was broken up. The auxiliary troops which had fought under the standard of Cassivelaunus abandoned the common cause and returned to their own homes, and the brave chief retired into his own territories beyond the Thames.

By his defiance of the Roman legions Cassivelaunus had singled himself out as a rival to Cæsar. To conquer him, therefore, now became Cæsar's ambition. He advanced towards the Thames to make war upon Cassivelaunus in his own territories. Anticipating such a movement, the British chief prepared for his defence. Cæsar reached the Thames at Coway Stakes, near Chertsey. The troops of Cassivelaunus were drawn

COWAY STAKES.

up in order of battle on the opposite bank. As the river was fordable, the bank of the river, and almost all the ford under water were fenced with sharp stakes. Bede says that these stakes were about the thickness of a man's thigh; that they were cased with lead; and that they were so securely driven into the bed of the river that they remained immoveable. It is supposed, indeed, that the oak-trees now seen in the Thames near Oatlands are the living representatives of these memorable stakes. But ingenious as the defence was, and formidable withal, the obstacle was surmounted by the indomitable Romans. They passed those stakes both horse and foot, and, astonished at the bold deed, the Britons after a feeble resistance took refuge in flight.

The greater part of the troops of Cassivelaunus was now disbanded. With a force, however, of four thousand chariots, the brave chief still kept the field. Many a Roman was cut off by that small force, as Cæsar marched forward; for Cassivelaunus was ever ready to make raids on his foraging and plundering parties, from his cover in the woods. So much was he dreaded that Cæsar was compelled to forbid his cavalry to make excursions into the fields without a strong body of infantry to protect them. It is clear that if there had been a cordial union among the British states, and that the Britons, as a body, had submitted to the command of Cassivelaunus, the Roman general, renowned as he was for warlike skill and achievements, would have found his match in our island home. The want of that union, however, defeated all the efforts of Cassivelaunus to drive back the invader. His chief enemies were the Trinobantes, or the people of Essex, Middlesex, and Surrey. In his wars with that people, Cassivelaunus had slain their prince, Imanuentius, and had obliged his son Mandu-

THE ANCIENT BRITONS ACKNOWLEDGING THE SUPREMACY OF CÆSAR.

bratius to flee into Gaul, lest he should share the same fate. No sooner had Cæsar, therefore, approached the confines of their territories, than they sent ambassadors to him, offering obedience and submission, and imploring his protection. Other states—as those of the Cenemagni, Segontiaci, Ancalites, Bibroci, and Cassi—followed their example, with all of whom Cæsar readily entered into an alliance. They gave him hostages, and corn for his army, and he promised them Roman protection. But it was not enough for these states to make their submission, they sought the ruin of the brave Cassivelaunus. Some of these people gave Cæsar information that he was in the vicinity of the capital of that great chieftain: a place to which numbers had fled for safety with their cattle. The so-called capital was little else than a wood, in which there were a number of villages, the whole being surrounded with a ditch and rampart. It was situated where the Roman city of Verulamium was afterwards erected, and near to the present town of St. Albans. Against this place Cæsar marched his legions, and it was quickly captured: some of its inhabitants fled to the neighbouring woods, but the Romans took many prisoners and much cattle.

Though thus deserted and defeated, Cassivelaunus still hoped to redeem the fortunes of his country. He was a brave-hearted patriot: one resolved to fight while hope was left. He now formed a scheme, which, had he been able to carry into execution, would probably have been fatal to the safety of Cæsar. As the Roman general was at a great distance from his fleet, he hoped to effect its destruction. Messengers were sent to the four chieftains of the Cantii to collect their forces, and fall suddenly on the naval camp of the Romans on the Kentish coast. The camp was attacked, but it failed: the men of Kent were defeated with great loss. Cassivelaunus now lost heart: he saw that it was vain to continue the unequal contest. Ambassadors were sent to sue for peace. There was little difficulty in procuring terms. Cæsar was heartily tired of his expedition into Britain. He was, moreover, wanted in Gaul; for while he was fighting in Britain, the Gauls had shown signs of rebellion against the Roman power. Peace was therefore readily granted to Cassivelaunus. Its conditions were these: that he should offer no injury to Mandubratius, who had been restored to his subjects, or to the Trinobantes themselves; that he should give hostages; and that he should pay a yearly tribute to the Romans. As the number of hostages are not mentioned, and the amount of the tribute not specified, it seems probable that Cæsar never had any expectations that these stipulations would ever be performed, and that they were made simply to save his honour, and to exalt the prowess of the Roman arms. Having concluded peace, however, with Cassivelaunus, Cæsar hastened back to the coast of Kent, and speedily set sail for the coast of Gaul, from whence he never again returned to Britain.

These accounts of Cæsar's expeditions into Britain are derived from his own pen; for Cæsar combined the author with the warrior. He was one of the most elegant writers Rome ever produced. His veracity as his own annalist, however, is open to grave suspicion. His very contemporaries call the truth of his "Commentaries" into question, insinuating that he was too prone to egotism. But, taking his own account of his two invasions of Britain as they stand, it is clear that he had no solid reason to boast of his successes. He may have carried hostages back with him to Gaul, and captives to adorn his triumph, but after all his toils and dangers, and lauded successes, he abandoned the island without erecting a single fort therein, or leaving a single cohort behind him to secure his conquests. As for tribute, he has left no record that he ever received any, and if he had, it would doubtless have been recorded in his pages. Beyond a corslet of British pearls, he is said to have exhibited no trophies of his vaunted conquest. Cæsar never did conquer

JULIUS CÆSAR.

Britain. He did not even see the greater portion of our beautiful island. His own story shows that in the first expedition he never left the sea-coast; and that in the second he never penetrated farther into the country than the vicinity of St. Albans. It is true that some Roman authors—admirers of Cæsar's warlike fame and character—have represented that he did conquer Britain and render it tributary, but no satisfactory proofs of such a conquest are given. On the other hand, Tacitus distinctly states that Cæsar did not conquer Britain, but only showed it to the Romans. Strabo takes the same view of his invasions, and even Cicero, who was with Cæsar in his second expedition, distinctly stated in a private letter to his brother, that at the time he wrote, the affairs in Britain afforded no foundation "either for much fear or much joy." But the strongest proof that Britain was never brought under the dominion of Rome by Cæsar consists in the simple fact that during the long period of ninety-seven years after his departure into Gaul, the foot of a Roman invader never trod upon British soil. As he found them, so he left them, and so they remained during the whole of that period, a barbarian, but an independent, liberty-loving people.

SECTION II.

TACITUS says that "after Cæsar's invasion there was a long oblivion of Britain." It sank again into obscurity. The historical data of this period, indeed, are of little more value than that of the earliest ages. It would appear, however, that after the departure of the Romans, the British tribes returned to the prosecution of their old intestine feuds. It is not unlikely that they were even increased by the results of Cæsar's invasion. Cassivelaunus had promised to refrain from molesting the Trinobantes; but when freed from his restraining power, it seems clear that he recommenced his wars with that people. And not with that people only. The tribes which had submitted to Cæsar's power, had sought his destruction, and *his* hour of vengeance had come—a vengeance that he transmitted to his posterity. During this period, by the power of his arm, and that of his successors, not only the Trinobantes, but the Dobuni, and several other neighbouring nations, were brought under their obedience, and three of them—the Ancalites, the Bibroci, and the Segotiaci—were so entirely subdued that they lost their very name and being as separate states, and are never after mentioned in history. One of the most illustrious successors of Cassivelaunus was Cunobelin, whose kingdom embraced a large portion of South Britain, and whose capital was Camalodunum, or Colchester. There is undoubted proof of Cunobelin's existence as a sovereign in various coins of his reign which are still extant. After his reign, his dominions were divided between his widow Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes, and his two sons, Caractacus and Togodumnus, who were the most celebrated princes in Britain when the Roman legions again appeared to contest the palm of victory with its chieftains.

Greater changes had taken place at Rome during this period than in Britain. Julius Cæsar had carried out his design of sweeping away the mighty Republic. After a long and bloody civil war with his rivals—the great Pompey being the most formidable—he entered Rome in triumph, and was made Dictator for life. He was on the eve of being clothed with the imperial purple. Already he had entered the senate-house to have the kingly dignity conferred upon him, but on a sudden his career was brought to a close. Brutus, and Cassius, and Casca, "all honourable men"—as Antony sarcastically called them in his oration over the corpse of the mighty dead—with other conspirators, slew him with their daggers. According to the law of Rome, every Roman was warranted to put any one to death who aspired to the regal dignity, and hence, no doubt, these conspirators felt justified in slaying Cæsar. The deed was consummated to save the sinking commonwealth. But there was yet a Cæsar existing by whose consummate wisdom, combined with power, his great kinsman's designs were carried out. In the year B.C. 27, Octavius, the son of Caius Octavius and Accia, Cæsar's sister's daughter, whom Cæsar had adopted as his heir, became Emperor of Rome under the title of Augustus Cæsar.

It was during the reign of Augustus Cæsar that Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was born. He was succeeded in the Empire, A.D. 14, by Tiberius Cæsar, in whose reign Christ was crucified. During the rule of these two emperors there was no attempt made to subjugate Britain to the Roman power. It is related that on three several occasions Augustus Cæsar threatened to invade Britain, but it is probable that he was restrained from it by his favourite maxim, "never to fish with a golden hook." The expeditions of Cæsar had been more expensive than profitable, and Augustus might anticipate the same result. Indeed, Tacitus expressly observes that Augustus refrained from invading Britain upon mature deliberation, and from motives of prudence. That Augustus never seriously designed the conquest of Britain is clear, for he recommended his successors never to enlarge the territories of the Romans, fearing that the same unlimited extent of dominion which had subverted the Republic might also overwhelm the Empire. According to Strabo, Augustus found it more profitable to cultivate the friendship of the Britons than to make war upon them, for he records that some of their princes made him presents, and even paid him tribute, and that he imposed certain customs upon all goods which were either exported from the Continent into Britain, or from thence to the Continent. The tribute mentioned by Strabo, however, must not be considered as the sign and token of subjection to Augustus, but free-will offerings from princes who desired to be at peace with him. Such presents were given to Tiberius, who seems never to have entertained an idea of the Britons being subject to his power, or of invading their coasts. During the reign of Tiberius, the Romans and Britons appear to have been on a footing of sincere friendship; for on one occasion, when some ships belonging to the fleet of Germanicus were driven by a tempest on the British coasts, the soldiers were hospitably treated, and sent back to their general. Tiberius was succeeded in the Roman Empire, A.D. 37, by his nephew, Caligula, who was one of "those monstrous examples which all history"—and that of the Romans especially—"presents, of an insane will united with unbridled power." Abandoning the wise policy of his predecessors in the Roman Empire, he designed invading Britain—if, at least, a madman can be considered to have the genius of forming a design. Some authors relate that Adminius, a son of Cunobelin, who had been banished the country by his own father, instigated Caligula to invade Britain, while others relate that Adminius met the mad emperor on his march, and surrendered himself to his power. But Caligula never invaded Britain. He led his legions to Boulogne, and, entering a galley, sailed a short distance to gaze on the white cliffs of Albion, and then returning, mounted a lofty throne, and gave his troops orders to engage the enemy. It was the most bloodless battle in which the Romans ever engaged, for the foe only existed in the mad brain of Caligula. The balistæ threw their deadly stones, but they fell harmless into the waters of the Channel. His menace of invasion served only to expose himself and the Empire to ridicule. It is gravely related that he ordered his troops to gather all the shells on the beach, and that he sent them to Rome as the chief ornaments of his triumph, and as the spoils of the conquered ocean.

The time, however, was now approaching when the Britons and the Romans were again to meet in mortal combat. Caligula was succeeded in the Empire, A.D.

43, by the Emperor Claudius. At this time, one Bericus, who had been driven out of the island for sedition, had fled to Rome for refuge. Bericus persuaded Claudius to attempt the conquest of Britain, and he resolved upon the enterprise. Aulus Plautius was selected by Claudius to the command of the army of invasion. He was to conduct that army from Gaul, and commence the war, and if he met with any opposition Claudius promised to come to his assistance. At the outset he was opposed by his own soldiers. It was the popular belief among the Romans that Britain was beyond the limits of the world, and that it was inhabited by a people of a fierce and cruel nature. No doubt the Roman legions had heard of the hard-fought battles in which their ancestors had been engaged with this brave race of another world. Frightened at the idea of such an enterprise, the soldiers of Plautius broke out into open mutiny. On entering the army, however, all Roman soldiers were compelled to swear obedience to their leaders, and under the Empire, by the life of their emperors. Reluctant as the soldiers of Plautius were, therefore, to embark for Britain, they were compelled to obey his commands. They were divided into three distinct bodies, so as to land at different points. It was a numerous host, for it consisted of four complete legions, which, with their auxiliaries and cavalry, amounted to about fifty thousand men.

These legions landed without opposition; for the Britons on this occasion were not aware of their danger, and consequently had made no preparations for defence. It is probable that they had heard of the intended invasion, but that they conceived it was only an empty threat, and that it would result, like the expedition of Caligula, in the old story of "the mountain in labour." But the Emperor Claudius was a man of a different mould to Caligula; when he designed the invasion of Britain he meant action, and not a feint. Hence it was that he chose Aulus Plautius for the enterprise, for he was a general of great wisdom and valour. Under him also there were Vespasian, the future emperor, Sabinus his brother, and other officers who had served with distinction in the recent wars of the Empire on the continent.

It was against the famous Trinobantes that Plautius directed the march of his legions. As before seen, the dominions of Cunobelin were at this time divided between his widow Cartismandua, and his two sons Caractacus and Togodumnus. There had been strife between these brothers, but in the face of the common danger they armed their subjects to meet it. Their policy was to act on the defensive, and to protract the war till the approach of winter, when they hoped that Plautius would, as Cæsar had done on two occasions, return into Gaul. As no enemy appeared, under the guidance of Bericus the Roman general penetrated into the interior, in search of the enemy. Caractacus and Togodumnus were successively engaged and defeated. The scene of these actions appears to have been among the Catti and Dobuni, for on the retreat of the Britons part of the latter tribe submitted to the Romans. Leaving a garrison in these territories to secure his conquest, Plautius advanced in pursuit of the Britons. He found them on the opposite bank of the Severn, and the passage of that river was bravely disputed; but Roman valour and discipline again prevailed. Vespasian, with his brother Sabinus, crossed the Severn, and did fearful execution. But a more bloody battle was fought on the following day, in which victory was for some time doubtful. The Britons fought with the Romans foot to foot, and when at length they were defeated they retired from that well-fought field to the north side of the River Thames, again to await the enemy. The spot selected by Caractacus for conflict with the Romans was this time in the midst of marshes and stagnated waters occasioned by the overflow of the river. Its passage was both difficult and dangerous, but nothing could withstand the progress of the victorious Romans. The Britons made a desperate stand, and caused the enemy great loss, many of them falling into impassable bogs, without the power of extrication; but some of the Romans having passed over a bridge higher up the river the Britons were overthrown.

By this time, however, Plautius had discovered that the fears of his legions to embark in this enterprise were not unfounded. He had defeated his enemies, but they were not conquered. After all their defeats they were still undaunted. Togodumnus had been slain, but his valiant brother still remained to contest the palm of victory with him. There were no proposals of peace or submission, and as his loss had been great, messengers were sent to Rome to call his emperor to his assistance. There is every appearance of his being in actual danger; for he no longer pursued the enemy, but retreated to the south side of the Thames, to act on the defensive, and await the arrival of reinforcements with Claudius at their head. Roman historians insinuate that he adopted this policy that he might not *finish* the war before the arrival of Claudius; but it was evidently adopted, as they record by the same stroke of the pen, that he might not expose himself to any disaster. We read in Scripture history of Joab, *after* he had taken the city of Rabbah, sending a messenger to King David—as we imagine, by way of courtesy to his monarch—to "come and take the city, lest it should be called after his"—Joab's—"name;" but Aulus Plautius was evidently not so polite as the renowned Jewish general. He had not conquered Caractacus, and he wanted and awaited reinforcements from Rome, with his emperor at their head, to aid him in his hitherto baffled enterprise.

Claudius came to Britain. Leaving his imperial throne empty, and Rome, "the city of the gods," together with his army, under the care of Vitellius, his colleague in the consulate, he embarked at Ostia and sailed to Marseilles, from whence he travelled by land to Boulogne, where he took ship for our island home. What his feelings were on first setting foot on the British shores, and as he travelled into the interior of the country to join Aulus Plautius, can only be imagined, not described. The squalid wretchedness of the habitations of the Britons must have contrasted strangely with the magnificence of Rome, with its gorgeous temples, baths, bridges, gates, theatres, amphitheatres, triumphal arches, columns, forums, and palaces. But Britain was inhabited by a brave people, who defied the Roman power, and Claudius hoped to reduce them to his sway. He joined Plautius on the

banks of the Thames, and upon his arrival the whole army crossed over that river to engage the Britons. Roman historians say that he gained a great victory over them, and that he afterwards advanced to Camalodunum, the capital of Cunobelin, which was captured.

JUNCTION OF THAMES AND IRWELL.

They add that he brought many tribes under subjection by force, and others by surrender; but it is clear that when Claudius returned to Rome he had made very little advance in the conquest of the island. Some few princes may have submitted to him, but the great body of the people was still unconquered. It is true that Claudius affected to consider Britain as a province of Rome, for he left Aulus Plautius in the island as its first governor; but at the same time Plautius was enjoined to prosecute the war, and the celebrated Vespasian was appointed second in command, for the double purpose of assisting him in the government and in the subjugation of the island. It is related that Vespasian, with one division of the Roman army, carried on the war against the Belgic Britons, who inhabited the sea-coasts from Kent to the Land's End, and that in the course of a few years he fought thirty-two battles with the enemy, the final result of which was that he subdued the Belgæ and Deurotiges, and reduced the Isle of Wight. In the mean time, Aulus Plautius waged an unsuccessful war against the inland Britons, under the command of the indomitable Caractacus. Plautius utterly failed in his mission to subdue the Britons, and yet when he was recalled from his government in the year A.D. 47, the vain-glorious citizens of Rome decreed him an ovation, or lesser triumph, and as he entered its gates the great Claudius walked by his side to the capitol.

If any portion of the Britons had been subdued by Plautius it was but imperfectly. He had scarcely left the island when all that both he and Vespasian—who appears to have returned to Rome with him—had done was thrown into confusion. The brave determination of the Britons to resist the greatest military power in the world is remarkable, and indicates a higher state of civilization than that which is generally attributed to them. On the other hand, the perseverance of the Romans to subdue a people whom they called barbarians proves that their conquest was considered to be of the highest importance to Rome's military fame. For three years after Plautius left Britain there was no Roman governor in the island. It seems to have been left to the commanders of the legions to keep order in the territories where Plautius and Vespasian had gained a footing. But they were unequal to the task assigned them. In the year A.D. 50 Ostorius Scapula was appointed governor in Britain, and on his arrival he found the cause of Rome in an almost hopeless condition. On every hand the Britons hovered round the Roman territories, and were carrying on triumphantly the work of plunder and destruction. Even those who had submitted to the Roman sway were ready to turn against their conquerors. Ostorius saw his danger, and prepared to avert it. In the midst of winter he led his troops against those Britons who infested the Roman territories, and defeated them. Tacitus intimates that he rid the Romans of their presence by the issue of a single battle, but it would rather appear that it was by a series of battles. And even then Ostorius did not deem the Roman territories safe from the fury of the Britons, for he built a chain of forts along the banks of the Avon and Severn for their protection.

Among the earliest allies of the Romans in Britain were the Iceni, who inhabited the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and Huntingdon. The Iceni had taken no part in the late wars, and had not even shown any hostility to the progress of the Roman arms. They were, however, now driven into revolt. In order to preserve the Roman territories from commotion, Ostorius commanded all Britons who were either subjects or allies to deliver up their arms. Peace-loving as the Iceni were, they would not submit to this imperious command. Joined by some neighbouring nations, they raised a large army to meet the Romans in mortal combat. They chose their ground for a decisive battle with great skill, it being inaccessible to the Roman cavalry. The battle was fierce and bloody, but the Iceni were defeated. Ostorius now marched his army westward, defeating the Cangi in his route, and on returning from thence he subdued a rebellion among the Brigantes, who occupied Yorkshire with parts of Lancashire, and who, like the Iceni, had made an alliance with the Romans. By this victory Tacitus says that Ostorius restored tranquillity to the country; but it was a tranquillity that could only be preserved by the presence of a camp and colony of veterans left among the Brigantes after his triumph over them. In no part of Britain indeed, not even within the chain of forts along the banks of the Avon and the Severn, were the Romans safe without a well-fortified camp for their protection.

In his wars with the Britons, Ostorius had hitherto not been confronted by any chief skilled in the art of war. He had been met by them bravely but not skilfully. It was not long, however, before he was called upon to encounter a people who to their bravery joined the utmost devotion to the cause of liberty, and who were commanded by the renowned Caractacus. These were the Silures, the ancient inhabitants of South Wales.

Having lost the greatest part of his dominions,

Caractacus entered into a league with the Silures, and placed himself at their head to make one grand effort for the liberty of his country. His presence inflamed the courage of the Silures to the highest pitch. The territory of the Ordivices—North Wales—was chosen by Caractacus for the scene of action. The spot appears to have been in every way favourable to his army, and adverse to his enemies. Tacitus says:—"It was on the ridge of an exceeding steep mountain, and where the sides of it were inclining and accessible, he reared a wall of stone for a rampart. At the foot of a mountain flowed a river dangerous to be forded, and a host of men guarded his entrenchments." Camden identifies this spot with a hill in Shropshire, near the confluence of the Coln and Teme, called Cær Caradoc, from Caradoc, the British name of Caractacus, where he says vestiges of the ramparts and entrenchments of the British army "are still visible." As the Romans approached, Caractacus drew up his troops in order of battle; and with the chieftains of the several tribes endeavoured to inflame their courage by inspiring harangues. Tacitus makes Caractacus address his army thus:—"From this day and this battle liberty must be rescued, or servitude eternally established. Call to remembrance your heroic ancestors who expelled Cæsar the Dictator: those brave men, by whose valour freedom from Roman tribute and taxes was preserved, and the honour of their wives and children protected." If Caractacus *did* thus harangue his army, never was language uttered more replete with true patriotism. That he fought bravely for the hearths and altars of his country the brief accounts of the conflict given by Roman writers testify. As the Romans scaled the mountains, the arrows of the Britons did fearful execution; but when the mountain heights had been reached, and it came to a hand-to-hand fight, the bows and arrows of the Britons were not a match for the swords and javelins of the Roman legions, and the sabres and pikes of the auxiliaries. The Britons fought valiantly, but they were defeated with great slaughter. The wife and daughter of Caractacus were taken prisoners, and his brothers shortly after the battle surrendered.

Caractacus escaped from this fatal battle to the court of his stepmother, Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes. That step was fatal to his liberty. He was betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and sent with his whole family captive to Rome. His fame had gone before him. The noble stand which he had made in defence of his country, for nine long years, against the power of Rome, had made him a hero. The people of Italy and the citizens of Rome longed for a sight of the brave Briton. Claudius himself was proud of such a prisoner, and resolved to make his entry into Rome as public as possible. The citizens were summoned on that occasion to gaze on the barbarian warrior: while the prætorian bands were drawn up under arms, and the emperor and empress took their seats on lofty tribunals. It was a grand day that at Rome. Many a captive had been led through its streets in triumph, but Caractacus appears to have been the most admired of them all. As he passed through the gazing throng of citizens, his dignity of deportment was the admiration of every beholder. Even before the throne of Claudius he exhibited no signs of fear or dejection. It may be that the oration which Tacitus records he made before Claudius and his empress is embellished, but it well answers to his character. That historian makes him say that he was a prince born of illustrious ancestors: a prince governing many nations, and master of men, and arms, and horses, and riches. That being the case, he asked if Claudius could be surprised that he had endeavoured to preserve them? If the Romans, he demanded, desired to arrive at universal monarchy, was every nation to gratify them by tamely yielding to their dominion? He then reminded Claudius if he had submitted without a struggle, the lustre of his victory would have been greatly diminished. He added, "If you resolve to put me to death, my story will soon be buried in oblivion; but if you think proper to preserve my life I shall remain a lasting monument of your clemency." Charmed with the boldness of the illustrious Briton, Claudius ordered his chains to be struck off, and he not only pardoned him but his whole family. What finally became of Caractacus, however, is unknown, as no further mention is made of him in the Roman annals.

The victory over the Silures, and the captivity of their brave leader, caused great joy at Rome. The triumphal ornaments were decreed to Ostorius, and the senate proclaimed the capture of the noble Briton as an event equally glorious to those of past ages, when conquered kings were presented to the Roman people; as Syphax was by Publius Scipio, and Perseus by Lucius Paulus. But though the Silures had sustained a signal defeat on the mountain of Cær Caradoc, their courage was still undaunted. Their hearts burned with resentment and the desire of revenge. Not long after their defeat they fell upon the Romans

ANTIQUITIES FROM THE THAMES.

as they were building forts in their country, and killed the camp marshal with eight centurions, and many of their bravest soldiers, and had not succour arrived from neighbouring garrisons, their victory would have been complete. Soon after this they defeated the Roman foragers, the troops that guarded them, and others which were sent to their relief. Ostorius brought his whole legions against them, and they then gave way; but they retired with little loss. Their resistance was so obstinate, that Ostorius is said

to have declared that he would root out their very name, like that of the Sugambrians, who were all either slain or transplanted into Gaul. But this only increased their animosity. They harassed his army by day and night with skirmishes, ambushes, and surprises, in one of which they captured two cohorts of auxiliaries who were plundering the country. So inveterate was their animosity, and so continuous and fatal were their attacks, that Tacitus expressly records Ostorius died of grief and vexation.

Ostorius was succeeded in the government of Britain by Aulus Didius. When he arrived in Britain, the Silures had defeated a Roman legion and were everywhere making incursions into the territories of the Romans and their allies. They had become more formidable than they had proved in the time of Ostorius. At this time they were under the command of Venusius, the chief of the Huiccii, who inhabited Warwickshire and Worcestershire. Venusius had been a friend and ally of Rome, but at this period, from private wrongs, he had become one of their most bitter enemies. He had married Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes, who had proved unfaithful to him, and had publicly taken her armour-bearer to share her throne. This infamous action caused a revolt among her subjects, but she was supported in her infamy by the Romans. Troops were sent to her assistance, and from that moment Venusius, who was famed for his military talent, became antagonistic to the Roman government. Cartismandua was driven from her kingdom, and many a Roman warrior under the governorship of Aulius Didius, and of Veranius his successor, became a prey to the vengeance of the insulted and injured chieftain. During this period, indeed, Nero, who in A.D. 54 had succeeded his father Claudius in the empire, is said to have seriously contemplated withdrawing the Roman forces from our island, and to have been only restrained from executing this design lest he should diminish his father's glory. But the truth is, Britain was still regarded by the ambitious Romans as a field in which military glory might be acquired; and it formed no part of the Roman policy, either during the commonwealth or the empire, to give up an enterprise in which the legions of Rome had once embarked. Defeat and disaster were invariably followed by renewed efforts to conquer.

In the year A.D. 59, Suetonius Paulinus was appointed to the command in Britain. Suetonius was one of the most celebrated generals of his day; one that emulated the deeds of the renowned Roman general Corbulo, who had recently annexed Armenia to the Roman Empire. Within two years he subdued several British tribes, and established colonies of veterans to keep them in subjection. Flushed with success he undertook a more important enterprise. He resolved to attack Mona or the isle of Anglesey, the chief sanctuary of the Druids. Mona was considered to be a safe asylum for the British warrior when defeated by the Romans, and thither numbers had resorted to as a sure place of refuge. But the chief motive which induced Suetonius to undertake this enterprise appears to have been the uprooting of Druidism. The Druids were the most deadly enemies of the Romans. It was the Druids who excited much of the opposition to the invaders, and so long as they existed as a body, Rome had no hope of conquering Britain. In the year A.D. 61, therefore, Suetonius led his legions through North Wales to their sacred island. His cavalry swam their horses over the narrow intervening strait, while the infantry crossed in boats. The scene which ensued has been related with graphic power by Tacitus, who probably gathered the particulars from his father-in-law, Agricola, who was an eye-witness. As the Roman legions approached the opposite shore, armed men were discerned in dense array; and women were rushing through their ranks, in funeral robes, carrying flaming torches, their dishevelled hair streaming in the breeze. Not more terrible is Até represented by the poets than these women are by Tacitus. With frantic gestures they were imploring the Britons — their husbands, brothers, and sons, perchance—to conquer or to die. To add to the terror of the scene, groups of Druids stood with uplifted arms invoking the protection of the gods, and heaping most dreadful imprecations on the heads of the Romans; while huge fires, prepared to consume the captives, sent up their lurid flames toward heaven. The scene appalled even the stout hearts of the Romans; for some time they stood motionless, but at length, exhorted by their general to despise a crowd of women and fanatics, they advanced to the charge and gained an easy victory. By that victory a blow was given to Druidism in Britain from which it never recovered; for Suetonius consigned the Druids to their own fires, cut down their sacred groves, and demolished their altars.

While Suetonius, however, was employed in the conquest of the Isle of Mona a grand effort was being made to overthrow the Roman power in Britain. No doubt he conceived that his destruction of the Druids, with their groves and altars, would henceforth make his path of conquest easy. He was mistaken. The insults offered by the Romans to their national worship, and their sacred places, only made the Britons more implacable in their enmity towards them. That alone was sufficient to induce a wide-spread revolt. But there were other causes for insurrection against the Roman power. Many of the tribes had submitted, but they had still a lively remembrance of their former freedom, and longed to be free again. And the Britons at this time had reason to be impatient of the Roman yoke, for it was no easy one to bear. An Agricola had not yet appeared among them as governor, to rule them with mildness and justice, and to encourage them to adopt the arts and civilization of the Roman people. Every day the Roman yoke became harder to bear, for the Roman officers and soldiers treated them as slaves. Even their old allies, the Trinobantes, were cruelly oppressed by the veterans settled among them in the colony of Camalodunum; while their neighbours, the Iceni, groaned under indignities still more insufferable. It was the universal system of the Roman government to oppress the provinces of the Empire, and Britain formed no exception. The world was the prey of the Romans, and whatever people they conquered they plundered. To what an extent the provinces were pillaged by them, Juvenal in honest indignation thus describes:—

"When Rome at first our rich allies subdued,
From gentle taxes noble spoils accrued;

Boadicea Haranguing her Troops.

Each wealthy province but in part oppressed,
Thought the loss trivial, and enjoyed the rest.
All treasuries did then with heaps abound,
In every wardrobe costly silks were found;
The least apartment of the meanest house
Could all the wealthy pride of art produce.
Pictures which from Parrhasius did receive
Motion and warmth; and statues taught to live.
Some Polycletes', some Myron's work declared;
In others Phidias' masterpiece appeared.
And crowding plate did on the cupboard stand,
Embossed by curious Mentor's artful hand.
Prizes like these oppressors might invite;
These Dolabella's rapine did excite;
These Antony for his own theft thought fit;
Verres for these did sacrilege commit:
And when their reigns were ended, ships full fraught
The hidden fruits of their exaction brought;
Which made in peace a treasure richer far
Than what is plundered in the rage of war.
This was of old; but our confederates now
Have nothing left but oxen for the plough,
Or some few mares reserved alone for breed.
Yet, lest this provident design succeed,
They drive the father of the herd away,
Making both horses and their pastures prey.
Their rapine is so abject and profane,
They nor from trifles nor from gods refrain;
But the poor Lares from the niches seize,
If they be little images that please.
Such are the spoils that now provoke their theft,
And are the greatest; nay, they're all that's left."

It was the plundering habits of the Romans, combined with their lust and cruelty, and their oppressive rule, that at this time drove the Britons into open revolt. The time seemed auspicious. Suetonius was far away with his legions, and had weakened the military posts in his rear by draughts from them in order to insure success in his attack on Mona. The circumstances which brought about this memorable event in the history of our British ancestors were briefly these.—Prasutagus, king of the Iceni, had recently died. He was a faithful ally of the Romans, and by his last will he had left his possessions to be ruled jointly by the Romans and his queen Boadicea. He hoped by this liberality, and the confidence he had placed in the Romans, to procure the emperor's protection to his kingdom and family. But his liberality was vain, and his confidence misplaced. No sooner was Prasutagus dead than the Roman government seized the whole of his dominions, and the Roman officers and soldiers took forcible possession of his personal effects. Nor were the family of Prasutagus the only sufferers: the whole country was spoiled and plundered by the rapacious Romans. Indignant at such treatment, Boadicea remonstrated, but this only led to further wrongs. The queen of the Iceni was beaten with Roman rods; her daughters were violated in her very presence; and her deceased husband's relations were reduced to slavery.

There was a loud cry for vengeance. The outraged queen appealed to her incensed deities against men who were "revilers, unjust, insatiable, and impious." The Iceni responded to her call. Every man among them, also, had his own wrongs to avenge. Tacitus represents them as complaining that, whereas they were formerly subject to one king only, they were now enslaved to two tyrants; to the governor, who lorded it over their persons, and the procurator, who laid hands on their fortunes. The Trinobantes had similar causes of complaint, for *they*, too, were deprived of their native lands, and, what was more galling than all, the Romans insulted them with the hated name of slaves. Stung to the quick, therefore, by insult and wrong, the Iceni and the Trinobantes flew to arms. Other tribes made common cause with them, and an infuriated multitude poured like an irresistible torrent on the Roman colony of Camalodunum. That colony was captured, its garrison put to the sword, and its buildings consigned to the flames. A detachment sent to the rescue of the colony was annihilated. A temple had been recently erected at Camalodunum to the deified Claudius. It was a fabric of great beauty and strength, but it fell a prey to the fury of the Iceni. It would appear, indeed, that they were not more excited to vengeance by their queen "bleeding from the Roman rods," and their own cruel wrongs, than by the erection of that temple, for it was looked upon as an insult to the national religion.

The first Roman colony in Britain, therefore, was utterly destroyed. The whole province was in danger of being lost. Alarmed at the storm he had conjured up by his rapacity and cruelty, Catus, the procurator of the province, fled into Gaul. The revolted Britons were everywhere triumphant. On their return from Camalodunum a whole legion of infantry was encountered by them and cut to pieces. They marched to Londinium, or London, which is now first mentioned in history, not as a Roman colony, but as a place "considerable for the resort of merchants, and for its trade." On receiving intelligence of the outbreak, Suetonius had by rapid marches across the island reached Londinium, but although its inhabitants entreated him to stay for their protection he withdrew and left it to its fate: allowing, however, such of its inhabitants who chose, to accompany his army. That fate was a cruel one; for such was the fury of the enraged Britons that they showed no mercy. Led by Boadicea, they entered Londinium, and put every one to the sword: old and young fell slain in one indiscriminate slaughter. The same catastrophe befel Verulamium, now St. Albans. It is said that not less than seventy thousand persons—Romans and their confederates—were massacred in these destructive inroads.

The army of the Britons increased daily. Tribes from every quarter sent reinforcements to aid in the destruction of the hated Romans. Tacitus says that they amounted to more than two hundred thousand men, but this is probably an exaggeration. It is certain, however, that they greatly outnumbered the Roman warriors under Suetonius, who was drawn up in battle array to meet them. The spot selected by him was in the neighbourhood of Londinium, but the locality has not been identified with certainty. His choice of ground was admirable. In the rear was an impenetrable wood, while the ground before him stretched out into a hollow and narrow valley with steep sides; so that he could only be attacked in front. Confident in their numbers, and flushed with their recent successes, the Britons under the command of Boadicea made sure of victory. They had even brought their wives into the field to witness the destruction of their enemies. On they came exulting and bounding in great separate bands, some on horse, and some on foot.

As they approached the Romans, Boadicea, mounted

on a chariot, dressed in her queenly habits, with a spear in her hand, and her two outraged daughters at her feet, drove through the army, and addressing herself to each nation, conjured them to fight bravely for the recovery of their liberty. She reminded them of her personal wrongs, and encouraged them to hope that Heaven would espouse their cause against the impious enemy, adding as a stimulant to their courage, "that she, though a woman, was determined to conquer or die, but the men if they chose might live and be slaves." Having ceased her harangue, the Britons advanced against the Roman army. Their shouts rent the air, and their arrows and darts flew thick and fast among their enemies. But all was vain Protected by their shields, which covered their

BRITISH WAR CHARIOT.

whole bodies, the Romans stood firm and collected till the Britons came within reach of their javelins, the discharge of which threw them into the wildest confusion. Then rushing upon the tumultuous host —the infantry with their swords, and the cavalry with their pikes — the Romans pierced into the midst of the British forces with the keenness of a wedge, and the rout became terrible. Roman historians record that eighty thousand were killed in the battle and pursuit; while on their side only about four hundred perished. These figures are open to suspicion, but at the same time it is clear that the victory of the Romans was complete; for the heroine of the revolt, the much-injured Boadicea, despairing of future success, ended her life by poison.

The power of the confederated natives of Southern Britain was broken, but the smouldering embers of revolt still remained. The unrelenting rigour of Suetonius, indeed, compelled the Britons to keep the field in self-defence, so that when he was recalled to Rome at the end of the year A.D. 61, the revolted tribes still remained unconquered. He had received reinforcements, but it was all to no purpose; the Britons still defied the Roman power. Nor were his immediate successors more successful. During sixteen years after the defeat of Boadicea governor after governor was sent from Rome, but there was no material advance in the tranquil and secure possession of the country. The only tranquillity enjoyed by the country was when the Roman governors, consulting their own ease, refrained from pushing the conquest of Britain. Such was its condition as a rule from the year A.D. 62 to the year A.D. 69, for its governors during that period—Petronius Turpilianus, Trebellius Maximus, and Vectius Bolanus—were all more or less indolent and unwarlike. The rule of these governors in Britain is designated as "inglorious" by Roman historians, but it was better calculated to win the Britons to obedience than the coercion of the sword. Acts of kindness were more likely to effect their conquest than a system of oppression. In truth, when Britain was conquered, its conquest, as will be seen, was effected more by conciliation than by the sword. In the mean time that weapon was employed in the vain attempt of its conquest by its keen edge. But before any forward movement was made in Britain great changes occurred at Rome. The house of Cæsar had become extinct; its last representative, the monster Nero, had been deposed, and at his own request slain by his freedman Epaphroditus. Then came a fierce contest for the Empire. Servius Sulpicius Galba was raised to the throne by the senate, and was deposed by the prætorian guards and slain by one of his own veterans; Marcus Otho was raised to the imperial dignity by the guards, but the German army proclaimed Vitellius emperor, and in a battle fought on the banks of the Po, Otho was defeated, and in despair committed suicide. It was Vitellius who sent Bolanus as governor to Britain, but he, too, had to contend for the empire and lost it. At that time the celebrated Vespasian was carrying on a war for dominion in Palestine. Vespasian was beloved by his legions, and on hearing of the accession of Vitellius, they saluted him as their emperor. There was a commotion in every part of the unwieldy empire of Rome on this occasion. The prætorian guards, dreading the strict discipline of Vespasian, espoused the cause of Vitellius, but throughout the provinces the legions were generally in favour of Vespasian. The battle of the rivals was fought in Rome itself. It was commenced by senators, knights, and city guards under the command of Flavius Sabinus, who fought for Vespasian against Vitellius, supported by the prætorian guards. A remarkable event occurred during this civil conflict in the city of Rome, the most deplorable, says Tacitus, that had happened to the Roman people since its foundation. Sabinus, unequal to the conflict, having fled with some of his soldiers and the senators to the capitol, it was besieged, and during the progress of the siege it was set on fire and destroyed. Such an event was not only the most deplorable misfortune to the Roman people, but it was to them also the most reproachful, since the sacred seat of the great Jupiter, reared by their ancestors with solemn benedictions and auspices as the pledge and centre of future empire, was impiously profaned and reduced to ashes, not by the hands of barbarians, but by the citizens of Rome themselves. While its smoke was yet ascending the cohorts of Vitellius burst in and put all who opposed them to the sword. But his triumph was brief. Along the great Flaminian road there was a mighty army from Illyria marching towards the city to fight for Vespasian. That army was flushed with victory, for it had, under the command of Primus, defeated the troops of Vitellius at Cremona with great slaughter, and had burned that city to the ground. Primus entered the city sword in

hand and took the camp of the prætorian guards by storm. Tacitus gives us a strange insight into the character of the Roman citizens at this period; for he says that the people were so little affected by the slaughter which occurred that cruel conflicts and luxurious banquetings might be seen in the same part of the street at one time. As for Vitellius, when the city was taken, he fled to his palace, which was lonely and desolate, from whence he was dragged ignominiously through the streets to the *Gemoniæ*, or place of execution, where he was put to death.

These contests for the imperial purple may explain why it was that the victories of Suetonius in the Isle of Mona, and over the heroine Boadicea, were not followed up. The Romans were doing fearful execution on themselves, and they had not the power to pursue the conquest of Britain. It is related, indeed, that when Vitellius was contending for empire with his rival Vespasian, he sent to Bolanus for succours *out* of Britain, and that Bolanus excused himself by alleging the unsettled state of the province. No doubt it was unsettled; and that if any troops had been withdrawn the safety of the rest might have been endangered. The legions in Britain, however, like those in Gaul and Spain, had declared for Vespasian, and Bolanus himself was wavering in his choice between the competitors.

Vespasian commenced the government of the empire with a vigorous hand. He restored the discipline of the army, which had become lax from demoralization; revived the authority of the senate, which had fallen into decay; and reformed the courts of law, which had long ceased to be courts of justice. In every part of the empire the vigour of his administration was felt, and in no part more so than in Britain. The bravest and the most active generals in his army were selected by him for the complete subjugation of that long-coveted island. Bolanus was recalled for his indolence, and perhaps for his doubtful fidelity, and Petilius Cerealis was appointed governor in his stead. By his bravery Cerealis propagated the terror of the Roman arms in Britain. Aided by the renowned Agricola, who now commanded the twentieth legion, he made war upon the Brigantes, the most numerous and powerful nation of the ancient Britons, and after fighting several battles in which the Brigantes, under the warlike Venusius, fought with great bravery, he reduced the greatest part of their country, and ravaged the rest. In the year A.D. 75 Cerealis was succeeded in the government of Britain by Julius Frontinus, a general equal in every respect to himself. Frontinus subdued the brave Silures, a people that had more obstinately contended with the Roman power than any other British nation. But notwithstanding their valour, their ardent love of liberty, and the difficult situation of their country, they were compelled to succumb to the Roman arms. In the year A.D. 78, however, Frontinus was succeeded in his government by a general more skilful in the art of war than he, and one who joined to his skill in warfare equal skill in governing a conquered people.

SECTION III.

HITHERTO Rome had sought the conquest of Britain by the sword alone. Agricola, who was now sent by Vespasian as his legate to complete the subjection, and to rule over the province, employed the arts of peace in conjunction with the sword. There can be no question but he was the greatest, best, and most famous of all the Roman governors in Britain. He was also the most favoured, inasmuch as his exploits in the battle-field, and his acts of government, have been immortalised in the historic page by the eloquent Tacitus. It is from the pen of Tacitus that we learn all that is recorded of this illustrious Roman; one of those great benefactors of the human race, who by their peaceful qualities determine the destinies of nations, and whose influence extends through all time. He was in the prime of life when he entered upon the government of Britain; adorned with the highest honours Rome could confer; learned, eloquent, brave, and virtuous; admired and beloved by the army he was called upon to command, and well acquainted with the people with whom he had to contend, and over whom he was appointed to govern. He had learned the rudiments of war in the Roman army in Britain under Suetonius; and for several years afterwards he served in that army under Paulinus with great honour. But while he had fought with the Britons he had evidently studied their character. He knew the deep love which they had for liberty, and that it would never be uprooted by oppression, and hence during his government, while he conquered them in the field of battle, he conciliated them by acts of kindness, and evidencing to them the practical utility of the Roman dominion.

It was at the end of summer when Agricola arrived in Britain, just after the Ordovices, an indomitable tribe who defied the Roman power from the fastnesses of Denbighshire and Caernarvonshire, had slaughtered a band of Roman cavalry stationed on their confines. The army had already separated and gone into quarters for the winter; but hastily collecting his troops, Agricola took the field, and coming suddenly upon the Ordovices he routed them in their mountains with great slaughter. His next exploit was in the Isle of Mona. The boast of Suetonius that he had secured that island was vain. It was conquered for the moment, but at this time it was repossessed by the chivalrous Britons. His chief difficulty in this enterprise was the want of vessels to carry his troops over the Menai Straits; but selecting a body of excellent swimmers he ordered them to pass the narrowest part of the channel with their horses and arms. This enterprise succeeded. Astonished at its suddenness and boldness, the Britons surrendered themselves and their island without risking a battle.

In his second campaign, A.D. 79, Agricola directed his march northward, into territories which had not yet submitted to the Roman arms. As much of the country was covered with woods, great care was taken by him to keep his soldiers together, lest the ever-active Britons should cut them off by surprises. His march was one of triumph. To those tribes who resisted he gave no rest till they were subdued, but to those who yielded he showed the greatest kindness.

Several British nations were, in the course of this campaign, brought to submit to the authority of the Romans; and to secure his conquests, a number of fortresses were erected, probably in that tract where the rampart of Hadrian and the wall of Severus subsequently crossed the island. In his third campaign, Agricola marched still farther north. He even entered Caledonia, a country hitherto unknown to the Romans. In this onward movement he traversed the territories of several British tribes without meeting with any opposition. These territories appear to have been parts of Lancashire, Westmoreland, and Cumberland. He penetrated to the river *Tau*, which some writers suppose was the Tay, and others the Solway Firth. The Caledonians were a hardy and warlike people, but they made no effort to oppose his progress, probably hoping that what they lost in the summer they could easily regain in the winter. But Agricola was a prudent general; what he gained he took care to secure. Forts were everywhere erected and well garrisoned, and although the Caledonians, when winter arrived, made several attempts to capture them, they were so well situated, constructed, and defended, that not one was lost. His fourth campaign, A.D. 81, was spent in securing the conquests he had made in the island, and hence, like that by which it was preceded, it was bloodless. A line of forts was erected across the narrow neck of land which separates the firths of Forth and Clyde; by which erection all South Britain was secured to the Romans, and the unconquered Britons were removed, as it were, into another island. The tract in which these forts were erected seemed to be the boundary of the Roman empire; but though they proved a barrier to the incursions of the North Britons into the south, they formed a starting-point, from whence the Romans penetrated farther north. In his fifth campaign, A.D. 82, Agricola crossed the Firth of Clyde and penetrated into the north-west parts of Caledonia, where he successfully encountered several tribes hitherto unknown to the Romans. These tribes appear to have been the Epedii, Cerones, and Carnonacæ, who were the original inhabitants of Cantyre, Argyleshire, Lorn, and Lochaber. From these coasts he might have had a distinct view of Ireland, and Tacitus says that, encouraged by an Irish chieftain, at that time a refugee in his army, he contemplated its invasion. But Caledonia was not yet subdued, and in the sixth summer, A.D. 83, Agricola explored the coast beyond the Firth of Forth. It seems probable that he passed that river in the vicinity of Stirling. He marched along its north banks and the coast of Fife, his fleet sailing near to the shore, to co-operate with the army. The perils attending this enterprise were great, and the mariners and soldiers, who had frequent intercourse, entertained each other with tales of their hair-breadth escapes and exploits, amongst barren mountains, gloomy forests, and tempestuous seas. For the Caledonians no longer submitted to the onward progress of Agricola. They were alarmed at the sight of the Roman fleet—feeling that the encircling ocean would no longer secure them against the invaders—but they were not dismayed. Their clans collected, and several fierce battles were fought, in which the Romans, though victorious, suffered great loss. On one occasion, by a night surprise, the ninth legion would have been destroyed, had not Agricola hastened to their assistance. Falling upon their rear with his light-armed foot and cavalry, while the imperilled legion attacked them in front, the Caledonians were compelled to retire into the neighbouring woods and marshes to save themselves from destruction. But though defeated they were still undismayed. During the winter they mustered all their clans for the next summer's campaign, with the determination to make one grand effort to preserve the independence of their country. Aged warriors who had laid aside their weapons, and the stalwart youth of the several states gathered together in great numbers; and that they might act with all their united force, they chose Galgacus, one of their greatest and bravest chieftains, as their common leader. On their parts, also, the Romans spent the winter in preparing for the prosecution of the war in Caledonia. When first attacked by the brave mountaineers, some of Agricola's officers had counselled retreat through fear, but success had revived their courage. All were now eager to penetrate into the deepest recesses of the land of mountain and flood, and to push their conquests to the utmost bounds of Britain.

At the approach of the summer of A.D. 84, the Caledonians, having removed their wives and children into their woods and mountain fastnesses for safety, to the number of thirty thousand, were encamped on the skirts of the Grampian Hills, where they awaited the shock of battle. With what number of forces Agricola approached those hills, no mention is made in history, but it seems clear that his army had been considerably increased by Southern Britons, who, won by his endeavours to improve their condition, were now as willing to fight for, as formerly they were eager to contend with the Romans. This union of the Britons and the Romans in the field of battle is a practical illustration of that celebrated passage in the pages of Tacitus which describes the character of the Britons under the Roman rule. "The Britons willingly," he says, "supply our armies with recruits, pay their taxes without a murmur, and perform all the services of government with alacrity, provided they have no reason to complain of oppression. When injured, their resentment is quick, sudden, and impatient; they are conquered, not spirit-broken; they may be reduced to obedience, not to slavery." At the approach of the Roman army, Galgacus drew up his troops in order of battle. According to Tacitus, Galgacus made an eloquent oration to the hardy mountaineers under his command, as he rode in his chariot through their ranks. His oration may be useless as an historical fact, but it aptly illustrates the nature of the war in which Agricola was engaged. In this oration Galgacus is represented as designating the Romans "tyrants, and plunderers of the earth." The nations they had enslaved, he said, were exhausted by tribute; stripped of the grain they had sown for their sustenance; compelled to make pathways through woods for the passage of their legions; to drain the marshes, and to dig mines for their oppressors. There was no way of escaping these evils but by victory: Flight, he reminded them, was as unsafe as it was dishonourable. Their enemies had penetrated into the heart of their country, and had covered their seas with their fleets. It

was not only for fame or victory that they were to fight, but for everything that was dear in life—their liberties, their parents, their wives, and their offspring. Galgacus concluded by calling upon his soldiers to call to memory their ancestors, who had been considered the bravest of all the British tribes; and to look forward to their posterity, whose freedom and happiness depended upon their valour. The Caledonians fought with great bravery, and victory long remained doubtful, but at length the steady courage and the discipline of the Romans prevailed. So long as the two armies fought with missile weapons, the Caledonians had the advantage; but when they came to close quarters, the long, broad, and heavy swords of the Caledonians were of little use against the spikes of the bucklers, and the sharp-pointed swords of the Romans, and the superior arms of their foreign auxiliaries: they were thrown into confusion and slain in heaps. In the battle and pursuit ten thousand are said to have been slain; and night only put an end to the carnage. In their despair, the Caledonians who escaped set fire to their houses, and some even slew their wives and children, to prevent their falling into the hands of their enemies; slavery being considered by them to be a greater evil than death itself. The next day presented an unusual scene to the Roman conquerors. There was a profound silence all around; the smoke of burning dwellings was seen on every hand; but not a living soul remained amidst the desolation.

It was a great victory which Agricola had gained, but it was not followed by any important results. After the battle, he marched into the country of the Horesti, now called Angus, from which tribe he received hostages. While in this country he gave orders to his fleet to sail northward, and to proceed to their winter station by the western coast. That fleet made a grand discovery. It had long been a subject of controversy among the speculative philosophers of Rome, as to whether Britain was an island or a continent. Agricola's fleet demonstrated that it was an island; for it arrived at the same harbour—the Trutulensian, probably Sandwich—from whence it had sailed eastward in the spring, thus having coasted entirely round Britain. Hence Tacitus makes Agricola address his army thus: "We possess the very extremity of Britain—Britain is completely discovered." His army was led slowly back through the conquered countries to South Britain, where it went into winter quarters.

This was Agricola's last exploit in Britain. At this time Vespasian, who had appointed him to the command in our island, was dead: the second only of all the Roman emperors that had died a natural death. His rule had been rigid, but he was sincerely and universally lamented. But it is remarkable that although sincere sorrow was displayed at his death, it did not degenerate into adulation. Those emperors who had scourged Rome without pity had been deified; but although he had really benefited the Empire, he was regarded by posterity as a mortal. In ridicule of this custom, he is said to have observed in his dying moments, "If I mistake not, I am going to be a god!" It is probable that this keen satire prevented his deification; for his son Titus, who succeeded him, but whose reign was brief, was, by his successor, Domitian, ranked among the gods. Vespasian, and Titus, and Agricola were men like-minded—all renowned for valour, but more illustrious as benefactors of mankind. Domitian was also the son of Vespasian, but he was notorious for debauchery and cruelty. At the time he received the news of Agricola's great success in Britain, he had just returned from an unsuccessful expedition against the Catti, whom Tacitus describes as the most warlike and polite nation among the Germans. He had taken some peasants prisoners, and the servile senate had voted him a triumph as though he had obtained a splendid victory. When, therefore he heard of Agricola's success, although he received it with joy in his countenance, there was deep anguish in his heart. He felt that his mock triumph, now that a real and mighty victory had been achieved by the Roman arms, would be held in derision. For among the various conquests of the Romans, that of Britain had proved one of the most difficult. Often had rude and undisciplined valour checked the victorious progress of their legions, and its subjugation was only effected by untiring perseverance, and a display of that indomitable courage for which the Roman soldiers were celebrated. Hence Domitian's envy and chagrin. Unable to endure that the name of a private individual should be exalted above that of an imperial warrior, Agricola was recalled to Rome. On his return, a triumph was decreed to the conqueror of Britain, but he wisely declined the honour, and retired into the seclusion of private life. He died A.D. 93.

The conquest of Britain, however, was not so much effected by the sword, as by his beneficent government. From the time he set foot in our island, as governor, to the time he was recalled to Rome, he was the benefactor of the Britons. His summers might be spent in campaigning, but his winters were employed in the civilization of the conquered. During his rule erratic habits were gradually exchanged for settled occupations, and peaceful pursuits superseded the feuds of the tribes. The useful arts, which Rome only could teach, became the delight of the Britons. Their old reed cabins gave way to superior dwellings; towns were erected with market-places, baths, and temples; and the graceful Roman toga adorned their once painted skins. Even the Roman manners and language were largely adopted; for Agricola was at great pains to have the sons of British chieftains instructed in the language, learning, and eloquence of the Romans: encouraging them in their studies by publicly stating that their genius was superior to that of the youth of Gaul. It may be that the British youth coupled their taste of the Roman arts with a relish for Roman luxuries and vices; but it cannot be denied that, under the rule of Agricola, great advances were made in civilization; that the rude manners and habits of the southern Britons underwent a great change for the better. In his government, Agricola was a bright exception to former legates. It was that of strict impartial justice to all, whether Romans or Britons. He heard the complaints of the latter with patience, and redressed their grievances with readiness. There were no longer plundering, extortion, and oppression; and though he exacted

tribute, he made the payment of it less burdensome than heretofore. It is no wonder, therefore, that, under the wise and mild administration of this illustrious Roman, the Britons became reconciled to Rome's dominion, and that he was looked upon more as their benefactor than their conqueror. Even to this day the inhabitants of this island owe the great Agricola a debt of gratitude.

He was succeeded in the government of Britain, A.D. 86, by Sallustius Lucullus; but from that period to the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 117, no particular account is given of the country by Roman historians. Lucullus, according to Suetonius, was put to death by Domitian because he had invented a new weapon of warfare which he permitted to be called the Lucullean lance.

Domitian, who was the last on whom the senate bestowed the name of Cæsar, was assassinated A.D. 96, and his immediate successors were Nerva and Trajan. Who the governors of Britain were during their reigns in unknown; and in what condition the Britons were can only be conjectured. As history is silent on the subject it may be that the genial influence of Agricola's rule was still felt: that they were contented and happy. This is the more probable as the rule of Nerva and Trajan in the seat of empire, Rome, was in a high degree marked by wisdom and moderation. The latter emperor, indeed, is considered by historians generally to have been the best of all the Roman monarchs. He died while pursuing great conquests in the East, A.D. 117, and was succeeded in the empire by his cousin and pupil, P. Ælius Hadrian.

Trajan was a man of war, but Hadrian was a lover of peace. An instance was given of his peaceful temperament at the commencement of his reign, for he abandoned the conquests of Trajan in Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria; and the Euphrates again became the boundary of the Roman empire, as it had been before those conquests. At the commencement of his reign, Hadrian resolved to make a progress through all the provinces of the empire that he might become personally acquainted with the state of each country subject to Rome. He arrived in Britain A.D. 120, and it is expressly stated that he corrected many abuses which had crept into its government. But his visit to Britain is chiefly marked in the pages of history by a rampart or wall of earth which was erected by his orders as the boundary of the Roman province. This rampart stretched from the mouth of the river Tyne on the east, to the Solway Firth on the west, near the track where Agricola had built his chain of forts. Eleven hundred years ago Bede describes this rampart as being at that time still famous, and says that it was eight feet in breadth and twelve in height in a straight line from east to west. By some historians it is supposed that the country north of this rampart had been recovered by the Caledonians after Agricola's departure; while others conjecture that Hadrian voluntarily resigned the conquest. If Hadrian's abandonment of the conquests of Trajan is taken into consideration, this latter supposition may be the correct one; for his policy appears to have been to secure the existing dominions of Rome, not to extend them. The rampart was of the greatest importance to the Romans. It served not only as a barrier against devastating hostilities from the Caledonians, but as a barrier against dangerous amities; for the Brigantes who dwelt in Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Durham, were not such willing subjects of Rome as the South Britons, and the Mætæ, who dwelt in the south of Scotland, were ready to join them in revolt.

Such an event happened in the reign of Antoninus Pius, who succeeded to the empire at Hadrian's death, A.D. 138. Lollius Urbicus was at this time governor of Britain. According to a passage in Pausanius the Brigantes had "made incursions into Genounia, a region subject to the Romans." This must be understood that the Mætæ who were of the same race as the Brigantes, and were often called by the same name, assisted by those of their kindred *within* the wall of Hadrian, had penetrated into Genounia, or South Wales. Urbicus therefore led his legions against the invaders, and having defeated them in several engagements, he recovered the country as far as the isthmus between the firths of Forth and Clyde. In order to secure this conquest, and to keep the Caledonians at a greater distance from South Britain, Urbicus raised another rampart between these two firths along the line of the forts of Agricola, a rampart which was designed as the utmost boundary of the Roman empire.

For several years during the latter part of the reign of Antoninus Pius—a reign which was the happiest period of the Roman empire—and the whole of the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, his adopted son and successor, Britain enjoyed comparative tranquillity. In the latter reign there was a revolt among the Mætæ, but it was readily suppressed by the then governor of Britain, Calpurnius Agricola. Aurelius died A.D. 180, and with him the glory of the Roman empire is said to have expired. The imperial throne of Rome had for more than eighty years been occupied by emperors worthy of the dignity—emperors who on the whole governed the empire with a paternal sway. That throne was now occupied by Commodus, the son of Aurelius Antoninus the philosopher, who has been termed "a monster of cruelty, lewdness, and insolence." The extravagances of Commodus quickly exhausted the treasury, and he had recourse to all kinds of rapine. Burdensome taxes were imposed; the government of the provinces and other offices were sold to the highest bidder; and criminals were exempted from punishment, and murders permitted, upon the payment of a certain sum of money. The whole city and empire became corrupted through his licentiousness and mal-administration. His oppressive government occasioned many wars, none of which were more dangerous than that of Britain.

In the year A.D. 183, the Caledonians broke through the wall of Antoninus, and, joined by the Mætæ, invaded the Roman province. Ulpius Marcellus was appointed governor of Britain to resist the invaders, and after several sanguinary battles they were defeated. Jealous of his successes, however, Commodus deprived him of his government, and his immediate successors appear to have been men unworthy of command. So unpopular were they that the legions broke

out into open mutiny. Pertinax, who afterwards became emperor, was sent into Britain to restore discipline, in which he finally succeeded; but as he was in danger of his life he was at his own request recalled to Rome. At the death of Commodus, A.D. 192, Pertinax was raised to the throne by the legions; but on his attempting to reform the licentiousness of the Prætorian guards within three months he was slain. Didius was raised by the same legions to the dignity of emperor, but in little more than two months he also shared the same fate. Didius had purchased the imperial diadem of the murderers of Pertinax, whence his brief reign is known in history as that of "the imperial merchant."

At this time Clodius Albinus was governor of Britain; and under him the island enjoyed profound tranquillity. He was popular with the legions, and the Britons: and at the death of Didius he was ambitious of becoming emperor. But he had two competitors: Pescennius Niger, who commanded in Syria, and Septimius Severus, in Illyria. Severus won the prize. At the head of the troops he commanded in Illyria, he hastened to Rome and was declared emperor. In order to secure his throne, the Prætorian cohorts were disbanded: they were ordered to give up their horses, arms, and military badges, and to retire one hundred miles from Rome. In order to conciliate Albinus in Britain, Severus declared him Cæsar, flattering him with the hopes of a higher title in order to keep him quiet till he had subdued his rival Niger. A bloody war ensued between these rivals, and in the end Niger was defeated and slain. Encouraged by his successes, Severus now resolved to destroy Albinus. It is said that he first attempted to remove him by assassination, on discovering which, Albinus made vigorous preparations for war. Albinus assumed the purple in Britain, and having strengthened his army with the flower of the British youth, he passed over to Gaul to dispute the empire of the world with Severus. In the year A.D. 197, a great battle was fought between these rivals near Lugdunum, now Lyons, in which Albinus was defeated. He committed suicide; and it is related that Severus, pleased with the sight of his lifeless body, rode over it several times, and then ordered it to be thrown into the Rhone.

In the meantime there was great commotion in Britain. As South Britain was left defenceless, the Mætæ and Caledonians made incursions into it, and wherever they came, there was wide-spread desolation. Virius Lupus was sent into Britain to repel the invaders, but he was unsuccessful. By purchasing their prisoners, he prevailed upon them to retire, but this only induced them to return. Year after year they renewed their invasions to take more prisoners and get more money. At length in the year A.D. 207, Severus resolved upon an expedition in person to Britain. He was old and infirm, but his warlike spirit was as active as ever. Roman writers say that he was prompted to come to Britain for a threefold reason—his love of military glory, his desire of keeping his legions in action, and of rescuing his two sons, Caracalla and Geta, from the licentiousness of Rome, into which they had deeply plunged.

Severus brought a mighty army with him to Britain. Alarmed at the preparations he had made, the Mætæ and Caledonians sued for peace, but in vain. At the head of his army he marched northward. Beyond the wall of Hadrian his route was surrounded with dangers and difficulties. His troops were harassed with perpetual skirmishes, and decoyed into numerous ambuscades. The nature of the country was adverse to the march of the Romans; for in some places it was covered with thick woods, while in others it abounded in steep mountains, deep marshes, lakes, and rivers. The Romans under Agricola, had not conquered that country, for had they done so, there would have been but few of these difficulties existing. Hence while one portion of the army of Severus was employed in resisting the sudden attacks of the enemy, the rest were employed in cutting down woods, draining lakes and marshes, making roads, and building bridges. It was a great labour; but all obstacles were overcome, and Severus at length penetrated into the very heart of Caledonia. His victorious progress struck such terror into the hearts of the Caledonians, that they again sued for peace. It was granted on condition that they relinquished a part of their country, and delivered up their arms, and he then conducted his army back into the northern parts of the Roman province. But not all his troops returned; for it is recorded that in this expedition he lost fifty thousand men, some by the javelins of the enemy, but more by the incessant labours of pioneering.

As the rampart of earth raised by Hadrian had proved but a slender security to the Roman province, Severus resolved to erect a more substantial barrier.

WALL OF SEVERUS.

For two whole years his troops were employed in building a wall of stone twelve feet high, and eight thick; to which were added numerous stations or towns, and still more numerous towers and castles. This wall, vestiges of which still exist, was erected nearly parallel to that of Hadrian. To render the barrier more complete, a deep ditch was dug on the side of Caledonia, and several military ways were made which are still called Roman roads. It was hoped that the incursions of the Caledonians would now be for ever checked; but that hope proved vain.

While Severus was at York, worn out with age, infirmities, and toils, the Mætæ and Caledonians renewed the war for the purpose of recovering that part of the country which they had ceded to the Romans. At the news of this revolt, Severus vowed that he would wage a war of utter extermination. Neither old nor young were to be spared, so comprehensive was his burning vengeance. But his days of war were over. Unable any longer to appear at the head of his troops, he commissioned his son Caracalla to execute his designs; and he, instead of attacking the enemy, spent his time in corrupting the legions. He aimed at the dignity of sole emperor to the exclusion of his brother Geta. It is related, indeed, that he sought to depose his father; and what was still more unnatural, to persuade his physicians to shorten his days. These crimes, however, were not consummated, for the aged emperor died a natural death at York, A.D. 211, having in his last moments appointed his two sons his heirs and successors in the empire.

On hearing of his father's death, Caracalla concluded a peace with the Mætæ and Caledonians—ceding the territories his father had obtained by the sword—and then hastened to Rome. His design was to seize upon the full sovereignty of the empire; but the legions, mindful of their oath of allegiance, and of the authority of the deceased emperor, proclaimed him and his brother joint emperors of Rome. But they did not long remain in union. They celebrated their father's obsequies with divine honours, and were acknowledged as lawful sovereigns by the senate, the people, and the provinces, but there was no unity of sentiment in these brothers. From their earliest childhood, Caracalla and Geta exhibited an aversion to each other, and as they grew in years, that antipathy became more marked than ever. When they assumed the reins of power, their hatred of each other became visible to all their subjects. Herodian says that they divided the palace between them from mutual animosity, and that their division of sentiment rent the whole empire into two factions. The tale is soon told. The sword of Caracalla was steeped in his brother's blood, and he became sole emperor A.D. 212.

From this time to the year A.D. 288 history is nearly silent on the affairs of Britain. During that period the island appears to have enjoyed profound tranquillity. The inhabitants of South Britain remained quiescent under the Roman government, while the Mætæ and Caledonians, having regained their own, made no attempt to disturb them, but lived in peace amidst their woods and their mountains. The emperors of this period were either unwarlike, or were employed in repelling invasions, quelling rebellions, and making new conquests in distant "fields of glory," so that the Britons were left solely under the care of their governors. Who those governors were, however, is unknown, for no record is left of their government, and but few of their names are mentioned, and those only on inscriptions. When Britain reappears in history it is under prominent circumstances. In the year A.D. 284 Diocletian ascended the imperial throne, and two years after he took M. Aurelius Maximianus for his colleague and partner in the Empire. It was not long, indeed, before these two emperors, finding themselves unable to defend all their provinces, made choice of two Cæsars—Galerius Maximianus, and Constantius Chlorus. It was while these four princes governed the unwieldy empire that the pen of the ancient historian resumes the story of Britain. At that time, A.D. 288, the seas and coasts of Britain and Gaul began to be infested by new enemies—Scandinavian and Saxon pirates. These bold sea rovers, issuing from ports extending from the mouth of the Rhine to the Baltic, swept the seas at will, and growing bold by success, made descents on the coasts for the sake of plunder. To repress these marauders the associated emperors of Rome prepared a powerful fleet in the harbour of Boulogne, and placed it under the command of Carausius. Had Carausius proved faithful to his trust their choice of a commander was a happy one, for though of humble birth, he had risen to fame for intrepidity as a soldier, and skill as a seaman. But the facilities offered by such a command for personal profit corrupted his fidelity. He beat the pirates, but as he never attacked them as they were outward bound, but only on their return, when they were laden with plunder, he soon fell under suspicion, especially as he never accounted for the booty he obtained to the imperial treasury. Maximianus, alarmed at his conduct, gave orders that he should be put to death, but Carausius escaped the danger. Having engaged the fleet under his command to follow his fortunes, he sailed to Britain, where he assumed the purple. His pretensions were equally favoured by the legions and auxiliaries in Britain, as by the fleet, and he became no contemptible pretender to the imperial diadem. He was absolute master of the narrow seas, of all the Roman territories in Britain, and of several important places on the continent. His cause was strengthened by an alliance with the Franks and Saxons with whom he had combated, many of them joining his fleet and army. There was no help for it. The Roman emperors were engaged in other wars, and not having a fleet equal to that of Carausius, made peace with him, and for several years he reigned as an independent sovereign in the island, and as lord of the surrounding seas. It seems probable that he enlarged the limits of the Roman empire in Britain by conquering the Mætæ, for it is recorded that he added seven castles and other works to strengthen the wall between the Forth and the Clyde. That he lived in pomp and state is manifested by inscriptions and devices found on his coins, many of which are still extant. He enjoyed his dignity till the year A.D. 293, when he fell by the hand of treachery; he was assassinated by his minister Alectus at Eboracum, or York, and his assassin succeeded to his dignity.

The reign of Alectus, however, was brief. In a recent division of the empire all the provinces beyond the Alps westward were assigned to Constantius Cæsar. At the time of the death of Carausius preparations were being made for the recovery of Britain, that being one of those provinces. He had besieged and captured Boulogne, one of the continental ports under the rule of Carausius, and was building ships in several ports of Gaul, intended for the invasion of Britain. His fleet was not ready till the year A.D. 296, when he set sail to Britain to dispute dominion

with Alectus. His fleet and army came to Britain in two divisions, one of which was led in person, and the other by the captain of his guards, Asclepiodotus. It was against the latter, who landed near the Isle of Wight, that Alectus led his forces, but his army was routed and dispersed, and himself slain. But the victory of Asclepiodotus was not complete. The army of Alectus chiefly consisted of Franks and Saxons, and after his defeat they marched to London in the hope of enriching themselves by its plunder, and then escaping by sea to their own countries. Their design was mercifully frustrated. At that critical moment a part of the fleet and army of Constantius, which had been separated from him by fog, entered the Thames, and falling upon the plunderers, defeated them with great slaughter, and thus saved the city from ruin. By these events Britain was reunited to the Roman empire after a dismemberment of more than ten years, and the seas were cleared of pirates and navigation restored, to the great joy, it is recorded, of both Romans and Britons.

In the year A.D. 305, the Roman empire fell under the dominion of two emperors—the two Cæsars, Constantius and Galerius. In the division of the empire between these princes all the western provinces fell under the dominion of Constantius, who resided in Britain. Constantius appears to have engaged in a war with the Caledonians; but no record is left of its operations, it being simply stated that he reduced them to sue for peace. But Constantius did not live long after this partition of the empire; he died at York A.D. 306, leaving his illustrious son, Constantine the Great, his heir and successor in the Empire.

A Roman panegyrist of Constantine writes:—"Oh, fortunate Britain! more happy than all other lands, for thou hast first beheld Constantine Cæsar." Some historians, on this slender authority, have asserted that Constantine was born in this island, but it would appear to refer to his accession to empire at York rather than to his birth. He was at York when his father died, and he was immediately saluted emperor by the Roman legions and by his British subjects with great joy. Constantine remained in Britain for some time, and he appears to have engaged in a war with the Mætæ and Caledonians—now called Picts and Scots—in which, as it is recorded that he settled the peace of the island on a solid basis, it must be concluded that he was successful. Constantine left Britain for the Continent to reduce the Franks who had revolted, and to dispute the empire with Maxentius, son of Maximianus the late emperor, who had assumed the imperial purple at Rome. On his leaving the island a great number of British youths went with him to fight with his legions for empire.

During the reign of Constantine, Great Britain enjoyed a profound peace. At his death, A.D. 337, he was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine, Constans, and Constantius. Britain, with Gaul, Spain, and part of Germany, fell to the lot of Constantine, but wide as this dominion was he was not contented with it. He invaded the dominions of his brother Constans—who, although the youngest son, appears to have had the largest portion of the empire assigned to him—and devastated the country round Aquileia in Italy; but advancing with imprudence, he fell into an ambuscade near the little river Alsa, now Ausa, and was slain with the greater part of his followers. Constans now seized all the dominions of his brother Constantine, and became sole master of the Western Empire A.D. 340.

At this time the Roman power was fast becoming a simple page in history. The seat of empire was no longer at Rome, but at Constantinople. That great and proud city, through whose gates captives from all quarters of the globe had been led in chains by the Roman conquerors, had been thus humbled in the sight of the world by Constantine the Great. He had adopted the Cross as the symbol of his faith, and had issued edicts which struck at the very root of paganism, and all Rome became arrayed against him. He was loaded with insults and execrations for abandoning the religion of their forefathers, and introducing new habits and customs in society; and his rage at such treatment made him resolve to transfer the seat of government from Rome to Byzantium, to which he gave the name of Constantinople. But apart from this cause for the removal of the seat of government, it was justified by considerations of the soundest policy. In the east the provinces were exposed to the attacks of the Persian Sassanides, a powerful dynasty, who aspired to the ancient empire of Cyrus; while in the west, the frontier of the Danube was insufficient to restrain the Goths and Sarmatians. Had the emperors, therefore, continued to reside in Western Europe, they would have endangered the most important part of their dominions. It was obvious that a metropolis on the confines of Europe and Asia would be more advantageous than Rome, not only for the promotion of peace in the Empire, but for its commercial prosperity; and Byzantium at once recommended itself by the political advantages of its central situation, and the opportunities it afforded for reviving the lucrative commerce of the Euxine and the Eastern Mediterranean. But while this change in the seat of government was favourable to the maintenance of the power and prosperity of the Empire, eastward, it was by no means so favourable as regards the provinces to the extreme westward. At this very time the Picts and Scots appear to have renewed their ravages in South Britain; for in the year A.D. 343, Constans is represented as coming to our island with a large fleet to chastise them. The extent of the chastisement he inflicted upon them is unknown, for the only testimony left of his exploits is derived from the flattering medals of this period. They convey an idea that there was a great slaughter of the Picts and Scots; but, as in a few years they reappeared in greater numbers than ever, it may be concluded that the medals of Constans made a great matter of a trifling advantage.

It was in the year A.D. 360 that the Picts and Scots burst through the wall of Severus in full force, to plunder the Roman territories in Britain. At that time, from the date of the visit of Constans to our island, there had been great changes in the imperial throne. Constans had been deposed and slain, and Magnentius, one of his officers, had become emperor of Britain and all the provinces on this side the Alps; Magnentius had been defeated by Constantius in the passes of the Cottian Alps, near the Mount Seleucus,

and had committed suicide; and Constantius had by this victory become sole sovereign of the Roman world. His cousin, Julian the Apostate, was created Cæsar by him, and had the chief direction of affairs in the western empire, taking up his residence in Gaul. Having heard of the invasion of the Picts and Scots in South Britain, Julian sent Lupinus with some troops to aid in repelling the enemy; but on their approach they retired into their own country, laden with plunder. In the year A.D. 341 Julian became emperor, and during his brief reign, and the still shorter reign of his successor Jovian, the Picts and Scots made no further attempt upon the Roman provinces. Jovian was succeeded in the Empire by the two brothers, Valentinian and Valens. That empire was now surrounded by enemies. It was everywhere assaulted—east, west, north, and south. In Britain, while piratical Franks and Saxons plundered the southern coasts, the Picts, Scots, and Attacots—now first mentioned in history—again burst through the walls of Severus and committed the most fearful depredations. So rapid was the progress of these fierce tribes, who appear to have been aided by some discontented natives, that Britain would have been lost to the Empire, had it not been for the heroic exertions of Theodosius, to whom its welfare was entrusted. Theodosius, who was one of the best and wisest men, and greatest generals of his age, not only restrained the ravages of these barbarians, but in some measure restored the prosperity of Roman Britain. On his arrival in the island, he found it in a condition which would require all his wisdom, skill, and valour to improve. The invaders had, in the year A.D. 367, carried on their destructive raids with impunity for three years, and had finally penetrated as far as London, carrying away with them many prisoners of both sexes and all ages, and much booty. It was in vain that the Roman forces stationed in the island had contended with them: they were everywhere defeated, and in one encounter they had slain a Roman general, and Nectaridius, "Count of the Saxon shore."

AXE HEADS.

Having assembled his army, however, Theodosius fell upon the marauders as they were retiring, and put them to flight, leaving their prisoners and booty in the hands of the conqueror. Having spent the winter in establishing tranquillity in the southern provinces, in the spring of A.D. 368, Theodosius marched northward, and everywhere drove the enemy before him. They were driven, indeed, beyond the wall of Antoninus Pius, which was now repaired, and made once more the frontier of the Roman territories in Britain; the country between the two walls being reduced into the form of a province, which was named Valentia, in honour of the Emperor Valens.

Theodosius remained in Britain two years, during which time garrisons were re-established, and the civil administration of the province wisely reformed. He was recalled by the emperor in A.D. 369, to be raised to one of the highest dignities of the Empire, that of master-general of the Roman cavalry. It is related that he was attended to the place of his embarkation by great numbers of the people, who loaded him with blessings for the protection he had afforded them, and the benefits he had conferred upon them. After his departure, the island enjoyed tranquillity for several years. The south coasts were secured by a powerful fleet against the piratical Saxons; and the Picts and Scots, taught wisdom by their recent defeat, made no further attempts upon the northern frontiers. But the Roman power was now tottering to its fall. Valentinian was succeeded in the Empire by his son Gratian, and finding himself and his infant brother Valentinian II. unequal to the task of governing and protecting all the provinces, in the year A.D. 379, Theodosius, the son of Theodosius who had commanded in Britain, was declared his partner in the throne. At this time the Goths were the most formidable enemies to the Roman Empire. They had ravaged Thrace, Scythia, Mœsia, and Illyrium, as far as the Julian Alps. The Quadi and Sarmatians, also, had entered the Roman territories, and had surpassed the Goths themselves in the cruelties they committed. Jerome, writing at this period, after describing their devastations, says: "The downfall of the Roman Empire is at hand." But the Empire was not only pressed upon in every direction by savage tribes, it was weakened by the strife of rivals for the imperial throne. There was a wide field for ambition in the tottering Empire; and the ranks of the Roman legions were by no means deficient of men possessed of that subtle and towering character. In the year A.D. 381 Maximus, an officer of great reputation, assumed the imperial purple in Britain. Had he been contented with his insular empire, he might have long ruled in Britain. He was a Spaniard by birth, but he had resided many years in the island, and had married the daughter of a British chieftain. Under Theodosius he had done good service in the expulsion of the Picts, Scots, and Attacots; and it was to him that the Britons had subsequently looked for protection against those formidable enemies. When, therefore, he assumed the purple, his pretensions were supported both by the Roman soldiers and by the provincial Britons. He was the emperor of their choice, and had he been attacked in his insular dominions, they would have fought most bravely in his cause. But Maximus was not long contented with his island kingdom. He aspired to the possession of the whole western empire. Circumstances seemed in his favour. Gratian was unpopular with the army; his brother Valentinian was still a child; and Theodosius was warring with the Goths. At the head of a large army, therefore, Maximus passed over into Gaul. The flower of the British youth accompanied him in his enterprise; for they crowded with eagerness to his standard from every quarter. Landing at the mouth of the Rhine, he prevailed upon the neighbouring provinces to join

his cause: Gildas says, not by force of arms, but by falsehood and perjuries. Gratian led his army against him; but to no purpose, his troops abandoned him and went over to the enemy. He fled towards Italy, but was overtaken and slain at Lugdunum, or Lyons. Elated with this success, Maximus declared his son Victor his partner in the empire, and fixed the seat of that empire at Treves. He obtained possession of Italy, and Valentinian II. was stripped of all his dominions. But the triumph of Maximus was brief. Theodosius, Emperor of the East, had beaten back the Goths, and he led his troops westward, to restore Valentinian to his dominions. Maximus was defeated in two great battles, and he retired to Aquilea, on the confines of Illyria, where he was betrayed to the conqueror, who put him to death. His son Victor was soon after defeated by the Franks in Gaul, and slain; and the British youth who escaped the slaughter, after having in vain endeavoured to find the means of sailing homeward, settled among the Belgæ, on the north-west coast of Gaul. The number of these settlers was so great that it is said they gave their name to that part of the Continent, which was henceforth called Brittany.

At the death of Valentinian II., A.D. 392, and of Eugenius the rhetorician, who usurped his throne, the empires of the East and West were reunited under Theodosius the Great. In the mean time the Roman province of Britain, which had been deprived of its defenders by the ambition of Maximus, had again been invaded by the Scots and Picts, while its coasts had been ravaged by the Franks and Saxons. Theodosius sent his lieutenant Chrysantus against them, who appears to have repelled their incursions, and to have restored tranquillity. There was, indeed, a brief season of peace throughout the Roman Empire. But the end of the Roman rule in Britain was at hand. In the year A.D. 395, Theodosius the Great died, and by his will the Empire again became divided. Arcadius, his eldest son, became emperor of the East, and Honorius, his youngest son, a boy of ten years of age, emperor of the West. Honorius was entrusted to the care and protection of the famous Stilicho, a general who had been the companion of all the toils and victories of the dead emperor. "But Stilicho was unable to sustain the dignity of the boy emperor. No sooner was the death of Theodosius known than enemies poured into the Western Empire from all quarters. In Southern Britain the Picts and Scots again laid

CELTS.

waste and destroyed, and the Saxons aided in their destruction. Stilicho sent troops into Britain, who

SPEAR HEADS.

appear to have checked their ravages; but while these events were passing in Britain the sun of Roman power was fast sinking below the horizon. It was the hour of vengeance. For a long series of years that power had lorded it over the world, and the world now rose in its majesty and might to quench that power for ever. The distresses of the Western Empire increased day by day. Africa was dismembered from it; Thrace, Hungary, Austria, and other provinces were laid waste by fire and sword, and Alaric the Goth, at the head of a fierce and great army of Goths, Vandals, and Alans, was marching in hot haste to the sack of Rome itself. The Roman troops which had been sent into Britain were recalled for the defence of Italy, and the Britons were left to contend with their enemies, unaided and alone, A.D. 407.

Britain now became harassed from within as well as without. The Roman troops constantly stationed in Britain became disaffected and mutinous. Marcus, one of their officers, was elected emperor, but he was quickly deposed and put to death. Gratian was next declared emperor, but in four months he shared the fate of Marcus. Constantine, an officer of inferior rank, was next exalted to the imperial dignity, merely on account of his bearing the name of an emperor long held in grateful remembrance by both Romans and Britons. Constantine had a longer tenure of power than his predecessors, but ambition led to his ruin. Following the fatal example of Maximus, he gathered around him the flower of the British youth, and passed over into Gaul to fight for empire. Gaul and Spain submitted to his sway, and he fixed the seat of his empire at Arles, which he named Constantia. His son Constans, who had been a monk, was associated with him in his empire, but their dignity was evanescent. Constans was intercepted and slain by Gerontius, who was fighting for a rival emperor in Spain, named Maximus; and Constantine was besieged in Arles by troops sent against him by Honorius, and though the Germans came to his assistance they were defeated; the city was taken, and the usurper was beheaded, A.D. 411. The British youth who had followed the fortunes of Constantine appear never to have returned to Britain, but to have settled among their countrymen in Brittany.

According to Zosimus the historian, "the neglect of Constantine"—that is, his desertion of Britain—"compelled both the inhabitants of Britain, as well as some of the Celtic nations"—in Gaul—"to revolt from the empire of the Romans, and to live independent of

them—no longer obeying their laws. The people, therefore, of Britain, taking up arms and defying every danger, freed their cities from the invading barbarians." This happened, according to that authority, in the year A.D. 409, and if so, Britain was then an independent state. An Anglo-Saxon chronicle, supposed to have existed in the time of Alfred, and to have been partly composed by that king, agrees with this chronology. It says: "In the year A.D. 409 the Goths took the city of Rome by storm, and after this the Romans never ruled in Britain." Bede gives the same account of the Roman rule, and Procopius, who flourished in the sixth century, distinctly states that after the defeat of Constantine the Romans had it no longer in their power to recover Britain. Some modern historians and antiquaries, however, extend the term of the Roman dominion to A.D. 420—allowing thereby the interval of a few months only between its extinction and the arrival of the Saxons. It is clear, however, that the Romans, after the pillage of Rome by the Goths—Rome, which had itself pillaged the world for more than a thousand years—no longer had it in their power to recover or even to protect Britain. In the year A.D. 412, it is recorded that Honorius sent an able general, Victorinus, for its defence, and that he struck terror into all his enemies; but the increasing distresses of the Empire compelled him to recal Victorinus with all his troops from the island. It is clear that the independence of Britain dates from the year A.D. 409, and not from A.D. 420; its utter severance may not then have been completed, but it owed no subjection to the Roman rule. By the withdrawal of the troops sent for its defence,—and which appear to have been sent out of friendship,—and by the late great emigrations of the British youth under the usurpers, Maximus and Constantine, the island was in a great measure left defenceless. We find, however, that in the year A.D. 414 the Britons, with the aid of some Roman veterans who had obtained houses and lands in the island, and who were unwilling to abandon them, were enabled to repel an invasion of the Picts and Scots. These marauders, however, came again and again, and the Britons once more sought aid from Honorius. In the year A.D. 416, the Goths having been expelled from Gaul, one legion was sent to their assistance, but having driven back the Picts and Scots into their own country they returned to the Continent. Three years after another legion performed the same service; but Gallio, who commanded that legion, having repelled the invasion of the Picts and Scots, and assisted the Britons in repairing the wall of Severus, which was henceforth to be the boundary of Southern Britain, gave them to understand on his departure that they were to expect no further assistance from the Romans. They were, he said, equal to their enemies in bodily strength, and every natural endowment, and that all they needed was to exercise their native courage, and then they might bid defiance to their dreaded adversaries. It was then, A.D. 420, that the Romans bade a final adieu to Britain; but it is manifest that the assistance recently given to the Britons was out of friendship, and not from any design to recover lost dominion. For several years the magistrates of Rome had been deposed by the Britons, which is a satisfactory proof that they had become independent long before the last Roman fleet set sail from their island. But though they were independent they were friends with the Romans. They met as enemies in mortal combat, but they parted in amity. During the first years of the independence of Britain, some Romans remained in the island, but others had recently disposed of their estates, and carrying with them their money and effects, had retired to the Continent. Hence the Saxon chronicle, above mentioned, records that in the year A.D. 418 the Romans collected all the treasures they had in Britain, "some of which they hid in the earth, so that no one had been able to find them, and some they carried with them into Gaul." That the final departure of the Romans was considered by the Britons as a national calamity there can be no question; they looked upon it with even more dismay than their ancestors had beheld their approach under the dreaded Cæsar. During the Roman rule they had been deprived of arms, except when required for foreign service, and conscious of their unwarlike character, and of their disunion as a people, they looked forward to the future with the most fearful forebodings.

Nor were their fears unfounded. No sooner had the Picts and Scots discovered that the Romans had finally abandoned the island, than they issued from their woods and mountains in greater force than ever, regarding the wealth of the country as their lawful prey. As the wall of Antoninus was left unguarded, the fine province of Valentia was quickly overrun by them. Year after year they wasted and plundered it, always returning to their native hills to enjoy the fruits of their forays during the winter. For, like their ancestors, the Caledonians, their incursions were made, not with a view of conquest, but of plunder. Had their design been conquest, they might have settled peaceably in the country between the walls of Antoninus and Severus—a country which would have afforded them a far better soil and climate than they possessed among their rugged mountains. Valentia was at length laid waste. Its inhabitants had fled; its habitations were destroyed; and its tribes swept away. Beyond the wall of Severus, however, there were provinces abounding in riches: provinces adorned with many noble monuments of Roman art and industry: covered with cities, towns, and villages; and whose fields were either laden with corn, or grazed by numerous flocks of sheep and herds of cattle. To these provinces the Picts and Scots now turned their attention. On they came like a flood toward the wall of Severus. It had been repaired, but it was ill defended. Its turrets, castles, and forts were, indeed, filled with garrisons, and its ramparts crowded with armed men; but after a faint resistance the Picts and Scots scaled the walls, and leaped the ditches at all points. The Britons abandoned the walls and fled, but many were slain in their flight, and their enemies plundered the country and returned home laden with booty. Season after season they renewed their incursions, plundering and destroying, and the condition of the Southern Britons became most wretched. As an enemy was almost certain to reap the fruits of their labours, agriculture was neglected, and the fairest sites of culture were turned into a wilderness.

DEPARTURE OF THE ROMANS FROM BRITAIN.

Nor were the ravages of the Picts and Scots the only evils endured at this period by the Southern Britons. There was everywhere civil rage and rapine. Unrestrained by law and government, they are said to have been more active in plundering and destroying one another than in repelling their implacable enemies. All government was at an end. Petty tyrants were set up in different parts of the country, but they had no power to preserve order. Added to this, the neglect of agriculture produced a famine, and the famine was followed by a pestilence, both which scourges swept away great numbers of the afflicted people. According to Gildas, however, these evils, which appear to have occurred about A.D. 440, had the effect of ridding the country for several years of the Picts and Scots. They dreaded the pestilence, and there was but little for them to plunder. He represents that during this interval of peace, the Southern Britons recovered some of their former prosperity; that they repaired their houses, and tilled their lands, which, after lying fallow for so many years, produced grain in an abundance hitherto unknown. According to the same authority, the people waxed wanton in their renewed affluence; that they plunged into intemperance and debauchery of all kinds. But their prosperity was not of long continuance. On hearing of the abundance which prevailed in South Britain, the Picts and Scots renewed their incursions, and the Britons were again reduced to their former hopeless condition.

Once more, and for the last time, A.D. 446, the Britons sought the aid of the Romans. Unable to withstand their enemies, they had recourse to Ætius, who now governed the Western Empire with almost absolute sway. Their letter was superscribed, according to Gildas, "The groans of the Britons to Ætius;" and it represented that the barbarians drove them to the sea; that the sea drove them back again to their enemies; and that the only choice left them was either to perish by the sword or by the waves. It must not, however, be supposed that the Britons could be shut up within such straitened limits as Gildas represents, though it is certain they were in a helpless condition. But if Ætius lent an ear to their groans, he had not the power to aid them; for at that time he was employed in collecting forces to resist the terrible Attila, who, at the head of an army of Huns, Goths, Gepidæ, Alans, and other nations, was advancing to attack the Western Empire. The Britons, therefore, were still left to their own resources.

At this time there were two parties in Britain: one consisting of Roman citizens who had remained on the estates they had acquired, and native families who had become connected with the Romans by marriage, and the various ties of civil life; and the other consisting of native-born Britons. The Roman party was headed by Aurelius Ambrosius, said to have been a descendant of one of the Roman emperors; and that of the Britons by Vortigern. It appears to have been the Roman party who sought the aid of Ætius. That application having failed, and the Picts and Scots still threatening to return in greater numbers than ever, Vortigern called an assembly of all the British kings, chieftains, and princes, to deliberate as to what was best to be done to prevent their ravages. Instead, however, of resolving to unite their forces to resist the enemy, the only question discussed was, to whom they should apply for aid. It was in vain now to make any further application to the Romans, for Attila had routed two Roman armies with great slaughter, and had dictated his own terms of peace. To whom, then, could the Britons turn in their extremity? Where were the people who could successfully fight against the renowned Picts and Scots? The Saxons were a nation abounding in shipping, and delighting in war, and they equalled, if they did not exceed, the northern clans in ferocity. But the Saxons had themselves in former years made fearful havoc on the coasts of Britain: how, then, could *they* be called into the heart of the fertile island? And yet it was to the Saxons that Vortigern counselled the Britons to apply; and, never reflecting that such dangerous allies might become their enemies and conquerors, the proposal of Vortigern was adopted. The old chroniclers relate that a deputation was sent into Germany to invite an army of Saxons into the island; but their story of a formal embassy to the court of the Saxons, and the abject speech which they put into the mouths of the ambassadors, appear to be unworthy of credit. They had no need to go so far as Germany on such an errand, for at that time there were three ships filled with Saxon warriors—pirates of the Baltic—cruising in the Bristol Channel, and it would rather appear that it was on the deck of one of these vessels that the Saxons received their invitation to come to the aid of the Britons. But wherever it was, that invitation was gladly accepted. In the year A.D. 449, they leaped on the shores of Britain; and having once gained a footing on our beautiful island, they never rested till they had either destroyed, enslaved, or expelled those whom they came to protect—till they had made that island their home and their country. Band after band came in their chiules, or long ships, until at length the conquest of Britain was completed, and a kingdom was formed which in after years became one of the most renowned in the world's history.

CHAPTER II.

The History of Laws and Government, from B.C. 55 to A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

WHEN Britain was first invaded by the Romans it contained many independent states, each of which was composed of several tribes or clanships. Thus, according to Cæsar, although the Cantii, or people of Kent, formed one of those states or kingdoms, there were no less than four kings presiding over them; which kings simply means chieftains or heads of so many clans or families of which that kingdom was composed. It was this division and subdivision of authority and rule that favoured the Roman conquest, for there could be no permanent union among tribes accustomed to war with each other; and where there is no union there can be no strength.

At the commencement of the authentic annals of Britain, the names and territories of the British or Celtic tribes were as follows:—

The Daumonii inhabited the south-west parts of Britain, probably that tract of country now called Cornwall and Devonshire. Other tribes appear to have been seated in that part of the country; namely the Cossini and Ostidamnii, which may have been particular clans of the Daumonii. Camden says that their territories were bounded on the south by the British Ocean, on the west by St. George's Channel, on the north by the Severn Sea, and on the east by the Durotriges.

The Durotriges possessed that country now called Dorsetshire, but it is not certain that they formed an independent state. As both they and the Daumonii were reduced by Vespasian at the same time, and with the greatest ease, and as neither ever revolted, it is supposed that they were united under one chief or king.

The Belgæ were seated to the east of the Durotriges, on the counties now called Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Somersetshire. In the time of Cæsar the Segontiaci possessed a part of this country, but they appear subsequently to have been incorporated with the Belgæ, as their name is soon lost in history. These Belgæ, as their name indicates, were a colony of a great and powerful nation inhabiting a great part of Gaul. Cæsar says that the seacoast of Britain was peopled by Belgians "drawn thither by the love of war and plunder," and the last horde of these settlers appears only to have arrived in Britain a few years before his invasion.

The Bibroci inhabited the country to the north-east of the Belgæ, a part, but not the whole of Berkshire. These people also came originally from Gaul, their name being derived from a town called Bibrax. As the Bibroci were but a small nation, they appear to have been subdued by some of the neighbouring British tribes between the periods of the invasion of Cæsar and Claudius; but although they thus early became extinct as a nation, their presence is marked in Berkshire by the name of "the hundred of Bray," that being derived from Bibroci, as Bray in France is derived from the ancient Bibracte.

The Attrebatii inhabited a part of Berkshire and Oxfordshire. This tribe was a Belgic colony from Gaul, that part which is now called Artois. It was one of those tribes which submitted to Cæsar, chiefly, it would appear, through the influence of Comius, who was, at the time he was sent into Britain to counsel submission to Cæsar, a king or chieftain among the Attrebatii in Gaul.

The Ancalites possessed parts of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, and they were probably a clan of their neighbours the Attrebatii; perhaps as they inhabited the pasture-ground of the two counties, they were herdsmen and shepherds of that tribe.

The Regni possessed the counties now called Surrey and Sussex. These were likewise a colony from Gaul, and, like all other Belgic Britons, very early submitted to the Roman power, and never revolted.

Eastward of the Regni, in that part of the country now called Kent, were the Cantii. It is supposed that this was the first district in Britain which received a colony from Gaul, and that it had frequently changed masters by new colonies coming over and driving the inhabitants further north. Cæsar says that the Cantii were the most civilized of all the Britons, and that they differed but little in their manners from the Gauls, which seems to indicate that they were recent settlers, although the resemblance may have arisen in some measure from the frequent change of intercourse between them and their Gallic neighbours on the opposite coast.

The Trinobantes were seated northward of the Cantii, in Essex, Middlesex, and part of Surrey. Their capital was Camulodunum, which is by some supposed to have been Maldon, though others place it at Colchester. They, likewise, were a colony from Belgium, and when the Romans appeared in Britain they were at war with the Cattivellauni, whose king, the brave Cassivellaunus, at the head of the confederated Britons, withstood the legions of Cæsar. The Trinobantes were among the first to desert the confederacy and submit to Cæsar, as they were also to yield to Claudius; but in the great revolt of the Britons under Boadicea they took a prominent part, and suffered accordingly. At that time their capital appears to have been at Trinow, or the "New City," which was the most ancient name of our present metropolis; and the Romans, charmed with its situation for health, pleasure, and trade, settled there in great numbers, giving it the name of Londinium from its situation, and of Augusta from its grandeur.

REMAINS OF A ROMAN HOUSE, LONDON.

The Cattivellauni inhabited the country north of the Trinobantes, and which is now divided into the counties of Hertford, Bedford, and Bucks. These were an ancient British people; but it is probable that at some remote period their ancestors came from Belgium, since the first part of their name, Catti, seems to have been derived from the Belgic word Katten. They were a brave and warlike people, and when led by Caractacus long defied the Roman power. Ptolemy mentions one of their towns under the name of Urolanium, which is identified with Verulam, near St. Albans.

The Dobunii were seated westward of the Cattivellauni, in the counties of Oxford and Gloucester. No mention is made of them as having resisted Cæsar, which may be taken as a proof that he never penetrated so far into the interior of their country. Subsequently they were oppressed by their neighbours the Cattivellauni, whence, on the reappearance of the Romans, they submitted to their sway for protection.

The Iceni were an ancient British people seated to the north of the Trinobantes, in that part of the country now divided into Suffolk, Norfolk, and Cambridge. Cæsar mentions them under the name of Cenimagni, and Ptolemy that of Simeni. They were a people who first owned the sway of the Romans, or at least entered into an alliance with them, but who revolted and bravely withstood them for the wrongs they received at their hands, and the gross insults heaped upon their queen, Boadicea. Their capital appears to have been Venta Icenorum, now Caister, near Norwich.

West and north of the Iceni, were the Coritani, or Coriceni, their country being that which is now divided into the counties of Northampton, Leicester, Rutland, Lincoln, Derby, and Nottingham. They appear to have been a branch of the Iceni, though some suppose that they derived their names from the different kinds of animals of which their riches consisted, the Iceni, from Yehen, "oxen," and Coriceni, from Cor, "a sheep." If they were not one nation they were in strict alliance with each other, and were both subdued by the Romans under Ostorius Scapula, at the same time. Their capital was Lindum, now Lincoln.

The Cornavii were situated west of the Coriceni, in that part of Britain now divided into Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, and Cheshire. Another tribe or nation appears to have been seated in these counties, inhabiting the best portions of Warwick and Worcester. Tacitus calls this nation the Ingantes, but their real name was probably Wigantes, or Huicii. Wigantes signifies, in the language of the ancient Britons, "brave men," which well answers to their character. It was their prince Venutius who married Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes, and under him the Wigantes, and Cornavii, and the Iceni and Coriceni bravely, though in vain, fought against the Romans.

That part of South Britain now called Wales was inhabited by three tribes or nations, the Silures, Dimetæ, and Ordovices. The Silures, besides the English counties of Hereford and Monmouth, occupied Radnorshire, Brecknockshire, and Glamorganshire. It is doubtful whether this tribe came from Spain or Gaul; but wherever they came from, they were a brave people. Former pages testify to their heroism; and the pains taken by the Romans to keep them in subjection by forts and garrisons when at length they were subdued, clearly prove that they were considered to be one of the bravest of the ancient British nations. The Dimetæ appear to have possessed the remaining part of South Wales, or Carmarthenshire, Pembrokeshire, and Cardiganshire. But it seems probable that they formed part of the nation of Silures; as no writer except Ptolemy mentions any other nation in South Wales, except the Silures. Perhaps they were their Cangi, or the keepers of their flocks and herds. The Ordovices were a people inhabiting that country called North Wales, or the counties of Montgomery, Merioneth, Caernarvon, Denbigh, and Flint. Some suppose them to have been of the same race of the Huicii of Warwickshire; but, unlike them, they were a free and independent people. With the Silures they fought bravely to maintain their independence, and they were only finally conquered by the renowned Roman general Agricola.

The situation of two tribes in this part of the country has caused much perplexity. These were the Cangi and the Attacotti. No satisfactory solution of the question can be offered; but it is probable that the Cangi were not a distinct nation seated in one particular locality, but a people employed in pastoral occupations among other tribes; and that the Attacotti inhabited a woody country farther north than any part of Wales. It was not till the latter period of the Roman domination that their name appears in history, and then it is in connection with the ravages of the Picts and Scots. Antiquaries say that their name is derived from the British words "at a coif," signifying "amongst woods;" and it is certain that they were a rude and barbarous people.

Eastward, north of the Coritani, were the Parisi, who, according to Camden, inhabited the whole East Riding of Yorkshire. But this tribe was evidently of minor importance, as they were always subject to the authority of their celebrated neighbours, the Brigantes.

The Brigantes were the most numerous, powerful, and ancient of all the British nations. Their terri

tories comprehended all that part of Britain divided into Yorkshire, Durham, Lancashire, Westmoreland, and Cumberland. It is supposed that they were the descendants of the ancient Phrygians, who first peopled Europe; and that they settled in Britain before the Belgæ arrived in Gaul. So many ages had elapsed since they came into Britain, that they appear to have lost all trace of the migration of their ancestors, for it was their settled belief that they were the aborigines of the island. Cæsar never saw that people, nor were they finally reduced to the Roman sway before the conquest of Agricola; although anterior to that period they had contracted an alliance with the Romans, their queen Cartismandua, especially, being their firm and faithful ally.

We now proceed to an enumeration of the northern tribes, broadly stating that the accounts given of them by Ptolemy and others are not so satisfactory as those given of the nations of South Britain.

North-east of the Brigantes, according to Ptolemy, were the Otedini, who possessed a long tract of the sea-coast from the Tyne to the Firth of Forth, or parts of Northumberland, Roxburgh, and the Lothians. It is probable that they were reduced by Agricola, at the same time as he subdued the Brigantes, and it is not certain whether they did not in reality belong to that nation. Like the rest of the Mæatæ, they were engaged in frequent revolts; and in the most perfect state of the Roman government in Britain, their country formed part of the Roman province called Valentia.

North-west of the Otedini, in the mountainous parts of Northumberland and Teviotdale, were the Gadeni, a small tribe whose name is said still to be preserved in the names of the river Jed, and the town of Jedburgh, both of which are situated in the country anciently inhabited by them.

West of the Gadeni were situated the Selgovæ, in those countries now called Eskdale, Annandale, and Nithsdale, which lie along the shores of the Solway Firth, to which they are supposed to have given its present name.

The Novantæ were situated north-west of the Selgovæ, in countries now called Galloway, Carrick, Kyle, and Cunningham. It is probable that their boundaries were the Irish Sea, the Solway Firth, the Dee, and the hills dividing the districts of Galloway and Carrick.

The Damnii inhabited the countries north of the Gadeni, and Otedini, now called Clydesdale, Renfrew, Lennox, and Stirlingshire. It was in the country of the Damnii that the wall of Antoninus Pius was erected to protect the Roman territories from the ravages of the Caledonians.

It was these five northern tribes who possessed the country between the walls of Severus and Antoninus Pius, and are called frequently by Greek and Roman writers by the general name of the Mætæ. As we proceed farther northward, our knowledge of the tribes of North Britain is still more imperfect. The wall of Antoninus Pius was the utmost limit of the Roman empire in Britain, for although Agricola and Severus penetrated farther north between the Firths of Forth and Clyde, they never made any permanent conquest. Hence the Romans knew very little of the tribes living beyond the boundary of the Roman province. So ignorant were they, indeed, of the country beyond the ramparts of Antoninus Pius, that they imagined it extended three times as far from west to east, as it did from south to north, which is directly opposed to the truth.

With such imperfect knowledge of the tribes living between the Forth and the Clyde, as is handed down to us by the Roman writers, we can only give a very succinct account of these tribes and their localities, not vouching for its correctness.

The Epidii inhabited the peninsula of Cantyre and, perhaps, some of the adjacent islands, and part of Argyleshire and Lorn. The Cerones were the most ancient inhabitants of Lochaber, and part of Ross. The Carnonacæ occupied the west coast of Sutherland, and part of Ross. The Carini dwelt on the north coast of Sutherland, and perhaps, according to Camden, in a small portion of Caithness. The Cornavii inhabited the most northerly point of Britain, called Strathnevern. The Mertæ, according to Ptolemy, were seated in the north-west parts of Sutherland; and the Logi in the south-east of that county. According to the same authority the Cantæ lived on the north side of the Tayne Firth. Next come the Caledonii, who possessed an extensive tract of country reaching from Loch Fyne on the west, to the Firth of Tayne on the east coast. The earlier writers of this period give the name of Caledonii to all the nations beyond the ramparts of Antoninus Pius, and that of Caledonia to their country, that tribe being the most powerful and warlike of all the inhabitants of North Britain. Besides all these, there were the Texali, on the coasts of Aberdeenshire; the Vacomagi, who occupied part of Murray, Athol, and Angus; the Horesti, who were probably the ancient inhabitants of Angus, and had become incorporated with the Vacomagi—since they are mentioned by Tacitus, and not by Ptolemy, who wrote at a later period—and the Venicontes, who appear to have lived in the counties now called Fife, Kinross, and Clackmannan.

Such appear to have been the tribes inhabiting North Britain, or those districts without the limit of the Roman empire. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, they were in the earlier part of this period sometimes called by the general name of Caledonii; but about the fourth century they appear to have been divided into two nations, and to have been first called Picts and Scots. It would be vain to inquire into the origin of these new denominations; but it may be mentioned that the most probable solution of the question—a question which has given rise to much learned controversy to very little purpose—is that they were given them by the provincial Britons out of revenge for the injuries which they had suffered by their frequent incursions; *Scuite*, in the language of the ancient Britons signifying "a wandering nation," which was the character of all the tribes of the western coasts of North Britain; and *Pictich*, signifying "thief" or "plunderer," which was equally characteristic of the tribes on the eastern coasts. Some writers have supposed that they were a different people from those before called Caledonians; but if any foreign nations had arrived in North Britain the event must have been known to the Romans, and would, therefore,

have been recorded in their annals. No mention, however, is made of such an event, and it may safely be concluded that the Picts and Scots were the original tribes who had merged into two marauding nations, in league with each other for the purposes of ravage and plunder.

The above appears to have been the political divisions of Britain before the Roman conquest. Concerning the number of the population there is no direct information. Cæsar says it was very populous, and he, with other Roman writers, speaks of the numerous armies of the ancient British states, but there is probably much exaggeration in their statements, designed to exalt the prowess of the Roman legions in their evident arduous warfare. It is certain that extensive tracts of Britain were at that time covered with woods and marshes, and, therefore, its population, though considerable, could not have been so great as Cæsar, and Tacitus, and Dio would have us believe. At the same time it must have been greater than some modern writers imagine, otherwise its inhabitants could not so long have withstood the advance of the Roman legions as they marched from one end of the country to the other. *Veni, vidi, vici* must then have been the universal pæan of all the Roman generals employed in this memorable conquest of the British island.

SECTION II.

Concerning the government of these ancient British nations there is very little information. It seems clear, however, that it was monarchical. Such a form of government invariably followed the patriarchal, and the British states formed no exception to this general rule in human societies. Britain contained many nations governed by kings. Such is the testimony of Cæsar, and of every Roman annalist of the period. The success of the Romans in Britain is attributed to this fact. Because they were subject to many different kings, there was no union among them; and hence their final subjection. One by one submitted to the Roman sway until their most ancient form of government was dissolved, swallowed up in the all-absorbing empire of Rome.

It is difficult to discover what were the rules of succession in these ancient British monarchies. It is clear, however, that they were not purely elective; that some member of the ruling family succeeded on the death of a prince; a son, if he was of an age and capacity to govern; if not, a widow, or daughter, or the next of kin. Sometimes, as in the case of Caractacus and Togodumnus, the dominions of a king were divided at his death among his sons, that division being made by the express will of the deceased monarch. That the ancient British kings had the power to devise their territories and authority is clear from the fact that Prasutagus, king of the Iceni, left his possessions to be ruled jointly by his queen Boadicea and the Romans.

But though absolute masters of their territories, the ancient British kings were not supreme masters of their people. Their power was limited. Their chief prerogative was that of commanding their forces in times of war. Whether male or female rulers it was theirs to command in battle. But even in the time of war their authority was not supreme. Deference was paid by them to the chieftains who commanded the several tribes or clans of which their armies were composed, and especially to the Druids, who always accompanied them to war. They could not give battle until the Druids had performed their auguries and declared them favourable; neither could they punish their soldiers, that power being wholly usurped by the Druidical priesthood. None but the priests, says Tacitus, can inflict confinement, stripes, or any correction; and *they* inflict them in obedience to their gods, who they pretend accompany them to war.

In times of peace the authority of the British kings was very subordinate. The chiefs then appear, indeed, to have resumed in a great measure their former patriarchal condition. The Druids were the law-givers and the administrators of the law. "All controversies," says Cæsar, "both public and private, are determined by the Druids. If any crime is committed, or any murder perpetrated; if any disputes arise about the division of inheritances, or the boundaries of estates, they alone have the right to pronounce sentence, and they are the only dispensers both of rewards and punishments." Their function as judges procured them the highest honours, for, says Strabo, "all the people entertain the highest opinion of their justice." In their capacity as administrators of the law, religion was made the instrument to enforce obedience to their sentences. The laws they made were supposed to be the commands of the gods, revealed only to the Druids, and none dared withstand them. If any one was bold enough to refuse to abide by their decrees he was interdicted from being present at their sacrifices, and was cast out of society as one impious and accursed, the power of the Druidical priesthood thus resembling the modern ecclesiastical weapon of excommunication. The offender might herd with the fox and the wolf, but not with men; he was lost to the protection of law, excluded from all offices of honour, and denied the necessaries of life, so irrevocable was the sentence of these priestly law-givers.

It would seem that the right of administering justice belonged to the whole order of Druids, and that certain times and seasons were set apart for the discussion of such causes as required deliberation. Their courts were no doubt held in the open air, and near to their temples, in order to give solemnity to their proceedings. The Archdruid appears to have been the supreme judge. All appeals were made to him from the tribunals of inferior judges, and his decision was absolute. Cæsar says that the grand assize in Gaul was held once a year in a consecrated spot in the country of the Carnutes, a tribe in the neighbourhood of Chartres, which was considered to be the centre of Gaul. It is believed by some that the grand assize in Britain was in the isle of Anglesey, the seat and residence of the Archdruid, while others consider it was held at Stonehenge, in the heart of Salisbury Plain. But wherever it was held, it seems certain that the Archdruid did once a year sit in solemn judgment on all cases of litigation, and that whatever his sentence was the people submitted to it as a decision emanating, through him, from the gods.

There is reason to believe that the ancient British states possessed a system of laws, but what that system was, as a whole, is unknown. Like all the other branches of learning, they were composed in verse and transmitted from generation to generation, orally. It was a rule laid down among the ancient Britons never to commit any of their laws to writing. It may be supposed by some that the art of writing was then unknown among the Britons. Cæsar, however, bears express testimony to the contrary, for he states distinctly that they made use of letters both in public and private transactions. It would appear, therefore, that the Druids never committed their laws to writing, chiefly for the purpose of monopolizing all legal knowledge. They only had leisure and opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the laws, and by keeping that knowledge from the people, it established their ascendancy over them.

From the scanty records of Greek and Roman writers, it would appear that the first law in the Druidical system was, that the gods are to be worshipped. Others related to themselves, their honours, rights, and privileges. Their persons, according to their laws, were inviolable; and they enjoyed immunity from taxation and military service. But they had laws for the regulation of society. For instance, under the Druidical system, a man could only be the husband of one wife. This law was firmly established among the ancient Britons. Among the Germans at that period, its kings or chieftains might be polygamists, but not so in Britain. Both kings and queens were subject to the law established, and if any presumed to violate it they were abandoned by their subjects. Thus, when Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes, married her armour-bearer while her husband was living, although she was supported in her profligacy by the legions of Rome, she was compelled to leave her kingdom. Other laws appear to have regulated the rights of parents, wives, and children; and others to have afforded protection to life and property. Capital punishments were awarded not only to murderers, but to thieves, robbers, and other criminals; and even when the severity of the penal law was mitigated by admitting compensations for the lighter offences, those compensations were so high that the punishment frequently exceeded the offence.

As regards the common law of the ancient Britons, it has been affirmed by Sir John Fortescue that they were in possession of that system of jurisprudence which is now the common law of the realm. He says: "The realm of England was first inhabited by the Britons; next after them it was ruled by the Romans; then again by the Britons; after whom the Saxons possessed it, and changed its name from Britain into England: then the Danes had for some time the dominion of it; then again the Saxons: last of all the Normans, whose posterity govern it at present. Yet in the times of all those different nations and kings, this kingdom hath always been governed by the same customs by which it is governed at present. If those ancient customs had not been most excellent, reason, justice, and the love of their country would have induced some of these kings to change or abolish them; especially by the Romans, who ruled all the rest of the world by the Roman laws." This, however, must be considered the language of hyperbole, for it certainly is not founded on historical data. The chief point of resemblance between the common law administered by the Druids, and that administered by the judges of the present day, is, that it was regulated by equity and justice: the application of those maxims being left in particular cases to the wisdom and integrity of the judges. But that the modes and forms of the common law of the Britons have been handed down to us through Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans, unchanged by conquests and revolutions, demands a doubt. At the same time some of its principles may be incorporated in English jurisprudence.

It would appear that the use of oaths or solemn appeals to their gods was practised in the law of evidence among the ancient Britons. Tacitus says that the forms of their vows and oaths differed among different states, each observing those which had been established in their country. If sufficient evidence was not given against an accused person, they had recourse to torture to extort a confession of guilt. Both these failing, it is supposed that the Druidical judges resorted to ordeals, applying to their gods for evidence against the criminal, through the medium of the art of divination. It is clear that such a practice existed among the Greeks and Romans, and among the nations of Germany; and as the Druids of Britain were the most skilful of all the various priesthoods of that period in the art of divination, and were believed to be able to discover the will of their gods whenever they consulted them, it is reasonable to believe that they would use such a kind of evidence in adjudicating on the question of innocence or guilt. It was not, however, till a later period that this form of trial takes a prominent place in the pages of English history.

SECTION III.

THE great Roman poet Virgil, in his poem "The Æneid," penned these lines, as translated by Dryden:—

> "Let others better mould the running mass
> Of metals, and inform the breathing brass;
> And soften into flesh a marble face;
> Plead better at the bar; describe the skies,
> And when the stars descend, and when they rise.
> But Rome! 'tis thine alone, with awful sway,
> To rule mankind and make the world obey,
> Disposing peace and war thy own majestic way:
> To tame the proud, the fettered slave to free,
> These are imperial acts, and worthy thee."

These lines have an evident allusion to the art of governing the countries which Rome had subdued by conquest. It is certain, indeed, that the Romans were great practical statesmen: that wherever they extended their conquests, they brought order, as it were, out of chaos. However desolating their wars may have been, yet when a country was laid under their feet by the power of the sword, for the institutions of barbarism those of civilization were substituted; and for misrule, wise laws and a well-regulated government.

The empire of Rome in its complete development consisted of two parts—Italy and the provinces. "The meaning of the term *provincia*," says Niebuhr, "which

was first given to Sicily, is explained by a forced and striking, suspicious etymology. The word *uncia* alone resembles it in form, where the *c* likewise does not belong to the root. It seems a simple plan to me to recognize it in only another form of the word *provectus*; it is used by Cicero in the sense of *prosodos*, and parallel to *vectigal*: consequently, taxable property of the state. For this is just the character of a Roman province: that, as a rule, it is not even authorized to have arms, but renders services to the sovereign state by finances exclusively: if the provincials are armed under extraordinary circumstances, they appear not as allies, but as auxiliary troops. Within the natural boundaries of a province, however, there were also allied states, and others which were recognized as free, and were not liable to tribute, but still were not subject, perhaps, to military service beyond these boundaries. This exemption was based on the republic demanding extraordinary service of them, and on their being under the immediate authority of the governor, while the allies of Italy only recognized the state over them." In this sense of the term there were no provinces till the Romans extended their conquests beyond Italy. How many there were, belongs not to this history: it will be sufficient to remark that when a country was conquered and rendered a province of the empire, it received its provincial organization either from the Roman commander, whose acts required the approval of the senate; or the government was organized by the commander and a body of commissioners appointed by the senate out of their own order.

These general remarks will receive illustration by a notice of the government of the province of Britain.

The expeditions of Cæsar made no change in the political condition of Britain. The ancient governments might have been momentarily disturbed, but they soon returned to their pristine condition. It was different with the invasion under the Emperor Claudius. More important consequences ensued from that invasion. Alliances were formed from which the Romans derived many advantages. Their allies were deprived of free action. They could not confederate with other British states in defence of their liberties; and the Romans became privileged to obtrude their commands upon them under a show of friendship, and if those commands were not obeyed, it gave them an opportunity of quarrelling with their allies, and reducing them to subjection. The Romans conquered Britain as much by artful policy as by force of arms. Tacitus states that "it was a custom which had long been received and practised by the Romans to make use of kings as their instruments in establishing the bondage of nations, and subjecting them to their authority." Hence it was that Claudius heaped such favours on Cogidunus, king of the Dobuni, not only permitting him to retain his own dominions, but even placing other states under his government. But these favours were delusive. Like all other kings on whom the Roman emperors bestowed their friendship, Cogidunus became subservient to, and dependent upon the Roman emperors. He was in reality their lieutenant, and might have been degraded at any moment, had he proved unfaithful to their cause.

Other means employed by the Romans to secure their conquests were by planting colonies of veteran soldiers in the countries in which they had gained a footing, and of granting freedom to some of the most populous cities. Thus a colony was planted at Camulodunum, and other places in Britain, and the valuable privileges of Roman citizens were conferred on the inhabitants of Londinium and Verulamium. Under the emperors the colonies were frequently established with circumstances of great oppression; lands being assigned to veteran soldiers, who took possession of them at the point of the sword, without any regard to existing rights. At other times, however, the foundation of a colony was an act of imperial grace, or merely a title of honour conferred on some spot.

It was by these arts, combined with the power of the sword, that the Romans finally conquered Britain. In the earlier period of the conquest our island formed a single province, and was governed by an imperial legate. The power of a Roman legate at that time was great. He was the supreme civil ruler, as well as commander-in-chief of the army. He was not even obliged to exercise his powers according to the established laws of the empire. His own individual will might be law, and he might appoint commissioners to sit in judgment for him. This appears to have given rise to much oppression. It was the grievances which arose from such arbitrary powers that Agricola redressed in the first winter of his rule in Britain. Subsequently, however, in the year A.D. 131, the emperor Hadrian promulgated an edict, called "the

HADRIAN.

perpetual edict," which swept away these abuses; for it defined rules which every governor of a Roman province, however remote it may have been from the seat of empire, was bound to observe in their judicial capacity.

Subordinate to the legate, whose title was *Præfectus* or *Proprætor*, but independent of him, being only responsible to the emperor, was the *Procurator*, or *Quæstor*, who had the chief direction in the collection

Nor were the ravages of the Picts and Scots the only evils endured at this period by the Southern Britons. There was everywhere civil rage and rapine. Unrestrained by law and government, they are said to have been more active in plundering and destroying one another than in repelling their implacable enemies. All government was at an end. Petty tyrants were set up in different parts of the country, but they had no power to preserve order. Added to this, the neglect of agriculture produced a famine, and the famine was followed by a pestilence, both which scourges swept away great numbers of the afflicted people. According to Gildas, however, these evils, which appear to have occurred about A.D. 440, had the effect of ridding the country for several years of the Picts and Scots. They dreaded the pestilence, and there was but little for them to plunder. He represents that during this interval of peace, the Southern Britons recovered some of their former prosperity; that they repaired their houses, and tilled their lands, which, after lying fallow for so many years, produced grain in an abundance hitherto unknown. According to the same authority, the people waxed wanton in their renewed affluence; that they plunged into intemperance and debauchery of all kinds. But their prosperity was not of long continuance. On hearing of the abundance which prevailed in South Britain, the Picts and Scots renewed their incursions, and the Britons were again reduced to their former hopeless condition.

Once more, and for the last time, A.D. 446, the Britons sought the aid of the Romans. Unable to withstand their enemies, they had recourse to Ætius, who now governed the Western Empire with almost absolute sway. Their letter was superscribed, according to Gildas, "The groans of the Britons to Ætius;" and it represented that the barbarians drove them to the sea; that the sea drove them back again to their enemies; and that the only choice left them was either to perish by the sword or by the waves. It must not, however, be supposed that the Britons could be shut up within such straitened limits as Gildas represents, though it is certain they were in a helpless condition. But if Ætius lent an ear to their groans, he had not the power to aid them; for at that time he was employed in collecting forces to resist the terrible Attila, who, at the head of an army of Huns, Goths, Gepidæ, Alans, and other nations, was advancing to attack the Western Empire. The Britons, therefore, were still left to their own resources.

At this time there were two parties in Britain: one consisting of Roman citizens who had remained on the estates they had acquired, and native families who had become connected with the Romans by marriage, and the various ties of civil life; and the other consisting of native-born Britons. The Roman party was headed by Aurelius Ambrosius, said to have been a descendant of one of the Roman emperors; and that of the Britons by Vortigern. It appears to have been the Roman party who sought the aid of Ætius. That application having failed, and the Picts and Scots still threatening to return in greater numbers than ever, Vortigern called an assembly of all the British kings, chieftains, and princes, to deliberate as to what was best to be done to prevent their ravages. Instead, however, of resolving to unite their forces to resist the enemy, the only question discussed was, to whom they should apply for aid. It was in vain now to make any further application to the Romans, for Attila had routed two Roman armies with great slaughter, and had dictated his own terms of peace. To whom, then, could the Britons turn in their extremity? Where were the people who could successfully fight against the renowned Picts and Scots? The Saxons were a nation abounding in shipping, and delighting in war, and they equalled, if they did not exceed, the northern clans in ferocity. But the Saxons had themselves in former years made fearful havoc on the coasts of Britain: how, then, could *they* be called into the heart of the fertile island? And yet it was to the Saxons that Vortigern counselled the Britons to apply; and, never reflecting that such dangerous allies might become their enemies and conquerors, the proposal of Vortigern was adopted. The old chroniclers relate that a deputation was sent into Germany to invite an army of Saxons into the island; but their story of a formal embassy to the court of the Saxons, and the abject speech which they put into the mouths of the ambassadors, appear to be unworthy of credit. They had no need to go so far as Germany on such an errand, for at that time there were three ships filled with Saxon warriors—pirates of the Baltic—cruising in the Bristol Channel, and it would rather appear that it was on the deck of one of these vessels that the Saxons received their invitation to come to the aid of the Britons. But wherever it was, that invitation was gladly accepted. In the year A.D. 449, they leaped on the shores of Britain; and having once gained a footing on our beautiful island, they never rested till they had either destroyed, enslaved, or expelled those whom they came to protect —till they had made that island their home and their country. Band after band came in their chiules, or long ships, until at length the conquest of Britain was completed, and a kingdom was formed which in after years became one of the most renowned in the world's history.

CHAPTER III.

The History of Religion from the Roman Invasion, B.C. 55, to the Arrival of the Saxons, A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

THE religion of the ancient Britons was of a remarkable character: a strange mixture of truth and error, the latter greatly preponderating. It was evidently derived from remote antiquity. At all events its first and purest principles must have descended to them from the patriarchal ages. Like all other Celtic nations, the Britons derived their origin from Gomer, the eldest son of Japhet, who doubtless communicated the knowledge of the one true God to his immediate descendants. That knowledge, however, soon became corrupted. Taught only by tradition, as time rolled on, its streams, at first pure, became more and more turbid, until at length but little of their original purity remained to mark the source from whence they flowed.

When Cæsar invaded Britain it was a sort of holy island. Its inhabitants were famous for their superior knowledge of the principles, and their zeal for the rites, of their religion. Cæsar distinctly states that such of the Gauls as were desirous of becoming versed in those principles and rites, visited Britain for that purpose. The priests who taught these principles and performed these rites were called Druids, men whose lives were chiefly spent in their sacred office. And yet religion was not the only business of the Druids. They presided over sacred things, performed all public and private sacrifices, and had direction of all matters pertaining to religion; but they were, at the same time, the judges of the land, the teachers of youth, lawyers, philosophers—moral and natural,—physicians, mathematicians, architects, musicians, poets, and historians. It was perhaps as much for their varied attainments as for their sanctity that the Druids enjoyed the highest honours and the greatest privileges in the island; for, according to Cæsar, they formed one of the only two honourable classes of the population: the equites, or military order, forming the other. Their persons were held sacred and inviolable. They were exempted from taxes and military services, and were held in such high distinction, that princes were ambitious of being admitted into their society.

The chief office of the Druids was that of presiding over sacred things: no sacred rite was ever performed without their presence. They were held to be the favourites of the gods and the depositaries of their counsels; and through them the people offered all their sacrifices, prayers, and thanksgivings. Their order was of three classes. There were Druids, who were the philosophers and theologians; the Vates, who sacrificed and pretended to foretel future events; and the Bards, who were poets, musicians, and historians. The official dress of the Druids was a white, flowing robe; that of the Vates a dress of light green; and that of the Bards a garment of sky-blue, which was regarded as a symbol of peace. Each order appears to have carried a wand or staff, and to have had what was called a Druid's egg hung about their neck, enclosed in gold. They wore their hair short and their beards long, in contradistinction to the people, who wore their hair long, and, with the exception of their upper lip, shaved their beards.

It was by the Druids, properly so called, that the offices of religion were chiefly performed. Notwithstanding, the Vates performed an important part in those offices. It was they who composed hymns in honour of the gods, which they sang to their harps in the sacred solemnities; and they were the pretended prophets of all the Celtic nations, who believed them to be divinely inspired in their poetical compositions, and blessed with revelations from heaven concerning the nature of things, the will of the gods, and future events. The Bards, on the contrary, appear to have taken no part in the offices of religion. They were the heroic, historical, and genealogical poets of Britain, as they were of Gaul and Germany, carefully abstaining from introducing anything of a religious nature into their compositions. At the same time it is clear that they formed one of the three great orders of the Druidical priesthood. They might be deemed secular priests.

DRUIDS' TEMPLE.

Of the number of Druids in Britain, no mention is made by Cæsar. Indeed, as he was acquainted with but a small portion of the island, he could have had no means of giving information. They appear, however, to have been very numerous; for while many lived a kind of monastic life near the places where they performed the offices of religion, others lived in the courts of princes and families of the nobles, to perform the duties of their function. Over all their body was an Archdruid, who is supposed to have resided in the Isle of Anglesey, where he lived in considerable state, surrounded by a great number of

the most eminent persons of his order. But while the Archdruid, and perhaps others of his order, lived in some degree of magnificence, and others in the courts of princes and nobles, some appear to have retired from the world, and from the society of their brethren, and lived as hermits, in order to acquire a higher degree of reputation for sanctity. It is said that in some of the western islands of Scotland there are still remaining the foundations of small circular houses, capable of containing only one person, which are supposed to have been the abodes of hermit Druids.

Of the revenues of the Druidical priesthood, we are as ignorant as of their numbers. As, however, they were held in superstitious veneration by the people, there can be no doubt that they were liberally supported. A great portion of the rich offerings brought to their sacred places would naturally fall to their share; and as they were often consulted, both by states and individuals, about the success of contemplated enterprises and future events, they must have made a rich market of their sacred functions. Added to this, they must have derived considerable profit from the administration of justice, the practice of physic, and the education of their numerous pupils in science and theology, especially as many of them were of high rank, and came from foreign countries. It is said, moreover, that they received annual dues from all residing in their respective districts, which were exacted with the utmost rigour; and that they had possessions of their own on the coasts of Britain and Caledonia. From all this it may be concluded that the Druidical priesthood was, as a body, the most opulent of any class of the period in Britain.

According to some writers, there were Druidesses as well as Druids; and that, like the Druids, they were divided into three classes: the first living in perpetual virginity, sequestered from the world, and were great pretenders to prophecy, divination, and miracles; the second, married devotees, who spent the greater part of their time in the company of the Druids, and in the offices of religion; and the third, such as performed the most menial services about the temples, the sacrifices, and persons of the Druids. It was these latter classes, probably, that struck such terror into the hearts of the Romans when Suetonius invaded the Isle of Mona, as recorded in a former page; for those of the first class, whom Mela calls "venerable vestals," were by no means numerous. They lived in small communities, and were consulted by the people as infallible oracles. It is recorded that the Emperor Aurelian on one occasion consulted them; and that one of them at another time delivered a warning to Alexander Severus. These women, however, appear to have been what would be more properly termed sibyls, or fortune-tellers. Strabo distinctly records, indeed, that the Druids never communicated any of their secret doctrines to the Druidesses, lest they should make them known, so that their position in the priesthood must have been very subordinate.

The chief doctrine taught by the Druids was that of the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls. When a man died, they held that his spirit did not perish, or pass into an eternal world, but was transferred into another body. This was a favourite principle of some of the most ancient creeds, both of the east and west. It was taught by the Gymnosophists and Brahmins of India, the Magi of Persia, the Chaldeans of Syria, the priests of Egypt, and by all other priests of antiquity. It was also the very essence of a doctrine taught by the famous Greek philosopher Pythagoras, which he seems to have derived from the Grecian and other mysteries in which he was well versed. The knowledge, therefore, of such a doctrine among the Druids of Britain goes far to prove that in ages long anterior to the Roman invasion, the Britons were in some way connected with the civilized nations of antiquity, for it cannot be supposed that, surrounded as they were "by the wall of the ocean," and cut off from the rest of the world, they could otherwise have become acquainted with such a mystical doctrine as that of the metempsychosis.

DRUIDS' WRITING DESK.

The doctrine of the transmigration of souls was taught by ancient philosophers, not because they believed in it, but because they considered it essential to the welfare of society; "for," says Pythagoras, "as the body is sometimes cured with unwholesome medicines, when such as are wholesome have no effect, so we restrain those minds by false relations which will not be persuaded by the truth. Hence there is a necessity for instilling the dread of foreign torments; as that the soul shifts and changes its habitation; that the coward is thrust into the body of a woman; the murderer into the fur of a savage; the vain and inconstant into birds; the slothful and ignorant into fishes." Similar motives appear to have actuated the Druids in teaching such a doctrine; for, like the ancient philosophers, and the Brahmins of India at the present day, they knew more than they chose to teach the people. Thus, while they them-

selves believed in the great doctrine of one God, the creator and governor of the universe, it was a doctrine *esoteric*, or secret; taught by them only to their own order. We are even told that while they taught the people to believe in the fabulous story of the transmigration of souls, they themselves believed in the sublime truth that the soul after death was immortal, and capable of enjoying sublime felicity. It is clear, indeed, that the Druids had adopted a maxim, which has not yet gone out of date, that ignorance was the mother of devotion; and that they conceived the common people to be incapable of comprehending rational principles, or of being influenced by rational motives. They were to be fed with the husks of superstitious fables, not by living truths. Their theology, indeed, appears to have consisted of an endless round of fables concerning the genealogies, attributes, actions, and offices of their gods; together with the methods of appeasing their anger, gaining their favour, and discovering their will. All their fables were taught in metaphorical verse, recited in the ears of the people from some eminence. Intermixed with their fabulous divinity, moral precepts were delivered for the regulation of their lives and conduct, the chief being to abstain from injuring one another, and to fight valiantly in the defence of their country. According to Lucan, their declamations had such an effect upon the minds of the people, that they were inspired with a supreme veneration for their gods, an ardent love of their country, an undaunted courage, and a supreme contempt of death. Cæsar bears the same testimony; and the courage displayed by the Britons in defence of their country against the imperial legions of Rome for so long a period, is an evidence that they were influenced by these Druidical exhortations.

How long the descendants of Gomer continued in the worship of the one true God is unknown. Ages may have elapsed before the Celtic nations fell into idolatry. At the time of Cæsar's invasion, the Britons were certainly confirmed idolaters. Gildas says that they had a greater number of gods than the Egyptians of old; but this was at a comparatively late date of their history: a date when their knowledge of the civilized nations of antiquity had increased, and whose examples they appear at all times to have been apt to imitate. Some of these might even have been borrowed from the Pantheon of Rome, that great repertory of the images of the gods of the Romans. In the earlier period of the history of Britain, however, it is clear that the Druids instructed the multitude in the belief of many gods, and in the worship of the sun, the moon, the stars, and the elements of fire and water. These were the first gods worshipped after they had lost the knowledge of the one true God: the sun, moon, and stars, especially, as being the most striking and illustrious objects in nature. The sun, for instance, was adored by them under the name of Bel, or Baal, a name by which that luminary was distinguished in Eastern paganism. Cæsar says that the moon was the chief divinity of the Germans, and the Gauls and Britons appear to have paid equal adoration to it as the sun; for their circular temples dedicated to these two luminaries were of similar construction. These were evidently the gods worshipped in the earliest stages of the Druidical worship; but when the Romans invaded Britain they had become greatly multiplied. Some of them, according to Roman writers—such as Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, Pluto, and Mars—answer to those of the classical nations of antiquity; but it is a question whether the Greeks and Romans did not derive these gods from the Celtic nations, inasmuch as all these deified princes belonged to the Celtæ by their birth, and were sovereigns of those tribes who peopled Gaul and Britain. But, besides all these, the ancient Britons worshipped other gods—gods who had been men in the flesh, and raised by their vain imaginations into deities. They also worshipped female divinities, or goddesses, as Venus, Minerva, Ceres, and Proserpine, and so low did they finally sink into idolatry, that almost every river, lake, mountain, and wood was supposed to have its presiding genii, or divinity.

The acts of religious worship among the ancient Britons were of a fourfold character: songs of praise and thanksgiving, prayers and supplications, offerings and sacrifices, and the various rites of augury and divination. The character of their songs of praise and thanksgiving, and their prayers and supplications, can only be imagined, not described, as, being delivered orally, none of them have come down to posterity. It would appear, however, that their prayers as well as praises were in verse, and made part of their poetical system of divinity. An important part of their religion consisted in offerings. Aware of the efficacy of gifts and presents in appeasing the anger and gaining the favour of their fellow-man, they imagined that they would be equally acceptable to the objects of their worship. In all ages of the world, indeed, offerings have formed a part of the religion of mankind. The patriarchs and the Hebrews laid their offerings on the altar as an acceptable sacrifice to the most high God; and such a mode of worship formed an integral part of the creeds of all the pagan nations of antiquity. But by no priesthood was it more encouraged than by the British Druids. Their sacred places were crowded with the pious gifts of the people, sometimes consisting of the most precious of the spoils taken in war, and sometimes of the most costly productions which could be procured by wealth. Such offerings as these were made by the donors from gratitude for favours received or desired; and as the fruits of vows made in times of trouble. To expiate guilt, however, and to escape the punishments of their gods, living sacrifices were offered on the altars of the Druids: the best of their flocks and herds; the most perfect and beautiful of their various kinds. Such sacrifices were on some occasions consumed by fire on the altar; but more frequently they were divided into three parts, one of which only was dedicated to the gods; the others being shared between the priests, and the donor and his friends. But the superstition of the ancient Britons did not stop here. The Druidical creed held "that nothing but the life of man could atone for the life of man," and hence human victims were sacrificed to their gods. Of this there can be no question. Strabo describes them as having been sometimes roasted together with cattle and beasts in an image of wicker-work, while at other times they were crucified or shot to death with arrows. Such victims were usually prisoners taken

in war, or criminals doomed to suffer for their crimes; but if there were no prisoners and no criminals, innocent persons were selected for sacrifices. Pliny says that the Druids ate a part of every human victim; but this is clearly a libel on their characters. The ancient Britons were not cannibals. They felt it their duty to offer up human sacrifices, but they were offered up with all solemnity, according to their religious rites and ceremonies. Some writers, indeed, have regarded the sacrifices offered up by the Druids as the homage of nature to the truth of revelation: the practice harmonizing with the great principle revealed in Scripture, "without shedding of blood is no remission," and which has marked almost every pagan system since the institution of expiatory sacrifices by divine appointment in the earliest ages of the world.

There is yet another fundamental article in the Druidical creed requiring notice: that of divination. The art of divination was practised by them in all its departments. Pliny says it was cultivated among them with such astonishing ceremonies that even the Persians might seem to have acquired their knowledge of the art from Britain. It was believed by the Britons that the gods whom they worshipped had the government of the world, and the direction of future events in their hands, and that they were willing to discover those events to their worshippers. Hence arose a belief in astrology, augury, magic, lots, and numerous rites and ceremonies, by which they hoped to discover the counsels of heaven regarding their future destinies. Their chief methods of divination were derived from victims offered in sacrifice. "They take a man," says Diodorus Siculus, "who is to be sacrificed, and kill him with one stroke of the sword above the diaphragm; and by observing the posture in which he falls, his different convulsions, and the direction in which the blood flows from his body, they form their predictions according to certain rules laid down by their ancestors." Various other arts of divination were practised by the Druids in common with all other nations, such as the flight of birds, and others too numerous to mention.

It seems probable that the ancient Britons had daily sacrifices, and performed daily acts of worship, especially in their most sacred places. Lucan says that they believed their gods visited their sacred groves at noon and midnight, and these, therefore, might be the hours selected for their daily services. The sun and the celestial gods might have received their homage at noon, and the moon and the infernal powers at midnight. On this subject, however, there is no direct information. Of their great religious festivals there are fuller accounts given by ancient writers. The ancient Britons divided their time by lunar months, not reckoning from the change, or from the full, but from the sixth day of one moon to the sixth day of another. This sixth day of the moon was always marked by a religious festival, their reason for choosing it, according to Pliny, being, "because the moon had grown strong enough, though not come to the half of its fullness." But beside these lunar festivals, the Britons had more distinguished festivals, which they held four times a year. One of the most remarkable was the solemnity of cutting the mistletoe from the oak by the Archdruid. The reverence paid to that parasitical plant when found growing on the oak was of the most profound character. Pliny remarks that they held nothing so sacred, and he has given a minute description of its gathering. "When any of it is discovered," he says, "they go with great pomp and ceremony on a certain day to gather it. When everything is in readiness under the oak both for the sacrifice and the banquet which they make on this great festival, they begin by tying two white bulls to it by the horns. Then one of the Druids clothed in white mounts the tree, and with a knife of gold cuts the mistletoe, which is received into the white sagum, or robe, of another Druid standing on the ground. This done, they proceed to their sacrifices and thanksgivings." This ceremony was performed on the sixth day of the moon, and as near as the age of the moon permitted to the 10th of March, the New Year's Day of the ancient Britons. Another annual festival was held on the first day of May, in honour of Belinus, or the sun. Fires were lit up in all their sacred places, and on the tops of all their cairns, and great sacrifices were offered to the sun, which now began to shine upon them in all its effulgence. On the eve of this day, all domestic fires were extinguished, and they were re-lighted at the time of the festival from the sacred fire always kept burning by the Druids. Other annual festivals were held on Midsummer Eve and the last day of October, the one to implore a blessing on the fruits of the earth, and the other to return thanks for those fruits now gathered in, and to pay their annual contributions to the Druids.

In the earliest ages, the Druids had no temples made with hands wherein to worship. It was a fundamental article of their creed that it was unlawful to build temples to the gods, or to worship them within walls and under roofs. Their rites were performed under the canopy of heaven, and in the midst of oaken groves. The deepest recesses of groves and woods were at once their sacred places and their abodes. It is probable, indeed, that their very name is derived from the Celtic word *drui*, which signifies an oak, and which may be translated "Oak men." It was their deep-rooted belief that everything which grew upon the oak came from heaven, and that God loved that tree above all others. But the veneration which the Druids had for the oak was not singular and without example. Abraham erected his tent and his altar under the wide-spread branches of a tree of that species. Even the Greeks, who erected magnificent temples to their deities, appear to have been impressed with an idea that a grove, above all other places, was best fitted to inspire thoughts of an ever-present Deity. As Britain, therefore, at that period must have abounded with groves of oak of the most magnificent growth, there can be no wonder that the Druids selected them for their places of worship. Usually a fountain or rivulet—reverence for which was another of the most prevalent of ancient superstitions—appears to have watered these sacred groves. They were also surrounded by a ditch or mound to prevent intrusion; and in the midst of them was a circular area, inclosed with one or two rows of huge stones set perpendicular in the earth. It was these

that formed their temples, and within which was the altar on which the Druids offered up their sacrifices. In some of them—as at Stonehenge—prodigious stones were laid on the tops of the standing pillars, forming a kind of circle aloft in the air, and greatly adding to their grandeur. Near to these rude temples, carneddes, or sacred mounts, were erected; together with cromlechs, or stone tables on which they prepared their sacrifices. The groves of the Druids have long been destroyed, but vestiges of their temples, carneddes, and cromlechs still remain in some parts of Britain, that of Stonehenge being the most perfect and the most remarkable. Some idea of these groves may be derived from the pages of Lucan's "Pharsalia:"—

"Not far away for ages past hath stood
An old, unviolated, sacred wood;
Whose gloomy boughs thick interwoven made
A chilly cheerless everlasting shade.
There nor the rustic gods nor satyrs sport,
Nor fawns, nor sylvans with the nymphs resort:
But barbarous priests some dreadful power adore,
And lustrate every tree with human gore."

As the ancient Britons had no temples, properly so called, so they had neither idols, images, nor statues to represent their gods. At the same time they had certain visible symbols or emblems of their deities. Thus Jupiter is said to have been represented by a lofty oak, and Mercury by a cube. Lucan, alluding to this fact, says:—

"Strong knotted trunks of oak stood near,
And artless emblems of their gods appear."

Oaks used for this purpose were truncated, they being considered the fittest emblems of unshaken firmness and stability. Images within and without the walls of temples in ruin are mentioned by Gildas, but these temples and images were either erected by the Romans, or by the Britons after the Roman conquest.

SECTION II.

At the period of the Roman invasion, the Druids were in the zenith of their power and glory. They enjoyed an almost absolute authority over their own countrymen, and strangers resorted to them for counsel. In war they were formidable, for they it was who excited the British warriors to courage in their conflicts with their enemies. Many a victory was gained by them, during their struggles for independence against the Roman power, in consequence of the influence which the Druids possessed in the island. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the Romans sought their destruction. They were the most dangerous enemies the Romans had in the island, and well they knew it. Hence it was not simply because the Romans abhorred their cruel rites that they sought their extermination, but because they knew that so long as Druidism existed, they could never hope to complete the entire conquest of the island. The subjugation of the Druids was a difficult task, but at length it was effected. So many of them perished by the swords of Suetonius and Agricola, and in the revolt under Boadicea, that they never afterwards made any considerable figure in South Britain. Those who would not submit to the Roman government, and comply with the Roman rites, fled into Caledonia, Ireland, and some of the smaller British islands, where they supported their authority and superstitions for some time longer, unmolested. But though the dominion of the Druids in South Britain was thus destroyed, their superstitious practices remained for a long time deep rooted in the public mind. Their superstition, indeed, continued longer in Britain than in any other country conquered by the Romans, an evidence that our island was the seat and centre of the Druidical faith. It was in vain that the Roman emperors issued edict after edict against the worship of the sun, moon, mountains, rivers, lakes, and trees; Druidism long survived in obscurity and decay. It was even received by the Saxons and the Danes. In the eleventh century, the English king, Canute, promulgated a law of a similar import to the edicts of the Roman emperors against this ancient superstition, evidencing that though the Druidical priesthood had become extinct, their practices still had fast hold on the popular imagination.

When the Romans had effected the conquest of Britain the established religion of the province became that of pagan Rome. This was only the substitution of one superstitious form of worship for another: more classical, indeed, but equally if not more corrupt. Glittering temples arose on every hand: dedicated to Jupiter and Apollo; to Diana and Venus; to Mercury and Minerva; and to the various other gods of Rome; temples which were adorned with the images, within and without, of the gods Rome worshipped. There was a temple of Minerva at Bath, and a temple of Diana is supposed to have occupied the same site which is now crowned by the magnificent cathedral of St. Paul's, London. The nature of the religion and the gods which the Romans substituted for Druidism may be gathered from the pages of Dionysius. "The Romans," he says, "reject from their religion as fabulous everything that is indecent and immoral. The tales of Cœlus mutilated by his sons; of Saturn devouring his offspring; of Ceres wandering over the earth; of the rape of Proserpine; the battles, the wounds, and the intrigues of the gods have no place in the Roman polytheism. Fictions of this nature, transmitted to us Greeks by our ancestors, and which contain records of scandalous and criminal deeds, were rejected by Romulus as guilty legends. He engaged his subjects to speak and think honourably of the gods, without attributing to them anything inconsistent with their beneficent nature. Hence everything connected with the worship of the gods is transacted in Rome with more piety and circumspection than amongst the Greeks and barbarians." Although, therefore, their principal deities were identified by the Romans with those of Greece, it was more in name than in nature. Their Jupiter was a being more remote from humanity than the Grecian Zeus; their Neptune more the deity that inspired good counsel than the god who ruled over the waters; and though Laneus was acknowledged the same as Hercules, he was honoured more for enforcing the sanctity of oaths than for his accomplishment of the twelve labours storied in Greek mythology. But though the Roman deities may be admitted to be

superior to those of the Greeks and other nations, they fell short of the true character of Deity. Like those of the Britons, which they supplanted, they existed only in imagination. Nor were the doctrines inculcated by the Roman priesthood superior to those taught by the Druids. Indeed, as among the Greeks, no mention is made of any class of priests on whom it was incumbent to instruct the people respecting the nature and in the principles of religion. All was addressed to the eye, and not to the understanding or the heart. Hence arose the widespread demoralization of the Roman world. The very priests themselves were corrupt, and by no means renowned for their sanctity, differing widely in this respect from the British Druids. Juvenal gives a lively description of the priests of pagan Rome. Writing of those of Bellona, who appear to have possessed great power over the minds of the multitude, the satirist says:—

"Bellona's priests, an eunuch at their head,
About the streets a mad procession lead:
His awkward clergymen about him prance,
And beat their timbrels to their mystic dance.
Meanwhile his cheeks the mitred prophet swells,
And dire presages of the year foretells.
Unless with eggs—his priestly hire—they haste
To expiate and avert the autumnal blast,
And add beside a murrey-coloured vest,
Which in their places may receive the pest;
And, thrown into the flood, their crimes may bear
To purge the unlucky omens of the year—
The astonished matrons pay before the rest."

Such was the character of the religion or superstition planted in Britain on the ruins of Druidism. But the soil of Britain was ungenial for its growth. Like an unhealthy tree it took root for a brief season, and bore some fruit, but it soon withered away. That it never took deep root in the popular mind is evident, for no traces of it are left—as there still are of Druidism in the ceremonies of All-Hallowmas, and the bonfires of May-day, and other customs in remote nooks and corners of our island—except in the vestiges of its material monuments. But there was another religion introduced through the Roman invasion which *has* taken root in Britain, and brought forth fruits of an enduring nature—a religion which gives part of its reward in hand below, and gives the best security for the rest above—Christianity.

At the time of the Roman domination in Britain, the religion of Jesus Christ was everywhere spreading throughout the Roman empire. The small mustard-seed sown by the apostles and first Christians was growing into a wide-spreading tree. Despite the cruel persecutions of the Roman emperors wherever a Christian community was formed, the followers of Christ increased and multiplied. The blood of the martyrs they slew—and they might be counted by thousands and tens of thousands—so watered the seed of the Christian church first planted at Rome by the apostle Paul, that it was growing into a tree which promised to overshadow the whole Roman empire. Christianity had even penetrated into the imperial palace of the persecuting emperors; and at length, by an imperial edict issued by Constantine the Great, who had become a convert, it was made the religion of the empire. All the subjects of that mighty empire were exhorted by that first Christian emperor of Rome to renounce their ancient superstitions; to adore but one God, the creator of the universe; and to place all their hopes in Jesus Christ. This great event occurred A.D. 323.

It is a matter of uncertainty who first disseminated Christianity in Britain. That was probably anterior to the Roman conquest. Eusebius asserts that it was some of the apostles, which is confirmed by Theodoret, who, after having mentioned Spain, says that St. Paul brought salvation to the isles which lie in the ocean. These testimonies of the fourth and fifth centuries are also supported by an expression of Clement of Rome, who wrote before the close of the first century. That writer expressly states, that St. Paul, being a preacher both of the west and the east, taught righteousness to the whole world, and went to the utmost bounds of the west. If these words are to be taken in their literal sense, then little doubt can remain that the ancient Britons first heard the words of life from the great apostle of the Gentiles. The testimony in its favour is certainly far stronger than the traditional testimony concerning St. Peter, St. James, Simon Zelotes, Philip, and Joseph of Arimathea: but whether Christianity was introduced into Britain by any of these holy men, or whether after the persecution, on the death of Stephen, by some of the Syrian Christians who were "scattered abroad," or by the devout soldiers of the same nation whom the famine foretold by Agabus might have driven into the armies of Claudius, and who might have come over with him into Britain, or by some of the Jewish converts dispersed over the world when Claudius commanded "all Jews to depart from Rome," cannot be clearly ascertained. It is sufficient to know that the island *was* early blessed by the dissemination of the Gospel, and that before the end of the second century some at least among the Britons had embraced its saving truths.

——— "The Julian spear
A way first opened; and with Roman chains
The tidings come of Jesus crucified:
They come—they spread—the weak, the suffering hear;
Receive the faith—and in the hope abide."—WORDSWORTH.

History is not the only testator of the existence of a British church in the earliest ages of Christianity. Popular tradition has long pointed to Perranzabuloe, or "St. Pieran in the Sand," a district near the sea, in Cornwall, as the site and sepulchre of an ancient British church which had flourished for a succession of ages, and had dispensed to a rude but religious people the blessings of Christianity in its simplest form of primitive simplicity. This church was founded by Piranus, celebrated for sanctity, about A.D. 404, and for ages the Cornish people pointed out a swelling mound of sand cast up by the turbulent ocean as the site on which it had been erected. It savoured only of legendary fiction till A.D. 1835, when the tale was indisputably confirmed by antiquarian research. The winds and the waves had marred many a previous enterprise, and the church slept on in her sandy bed; but at that period every obstacle was overcome, and it was revealed in all its unpretending simplicity, and its rude but solid workmanship, to the wonder of antiquaries.

The discovery of the ancient church of "St. Pieran in the Sand," at once proved the independence and the

primitive purity of the ancient British church. In its interior, none of the accompaniments of a Romish place of worship was found. There was no rood-loft for the hanging up of the host, nor the vain display of fabricated relics. No latticed confessional was there; neither was there any sacring bell, or daubed and decorated images of the Virgin Mary, or of saints, to indicate the idolatry of the worshippers. In vain did the discoverers of the precious relic look for any confirmation that the unscriptural adoration of the wafer, and the equally unscriptural masses for the dead had formed a part of their faith. They had evidently used neither beads nor rosaries, neither pyxes nor agnus deis, neither censers nor crucifixes; for not the remnant of either one or the other could be discovered. At the eastern end was a plain unornamented chancel, in which stood a simple stone altar, and in its nave were stone seats of similar construction, attached to the western, southern, and northern walls. Its primitive simplicity seemed to demonstrate that the faith of the ancient British church was at that period uncorrupted—that it harmonized with that taught by the apostles in the earliest ages of Christianity. The sea has again covered it with its sands, but the tale it has told will exist through all time.

During the first three centuries, the doctrine of the British church was probably the same as that of the Apostles' Creed. Bede says it was not infected with heresy till the days of Arius. Its rites and ceremonies appear to have been the same as that of other churches, except that in keeping of Easter the practice of the Asian churches was followed rather than that of Rome. Little, however, is known of the British church before the third century. It must have flourished; for in the persecution of "Diocletian's fiery sword," which worked "busy as the lightning" throughout the empire, there were found therein men willing to offer up their lives for the sake of the Gospel. In that persecution, Alban, "England's first martyr," perished at Verulamium; and Julian, Aaron, and others shared his fate. This persecution was stopped when Constantius Chlorus was declared emperor; and at his death, which took place at York, when his son Constantine the Great began his reign, most of the outward miseries of the followers of Christ terminated. A.D. 307.

During the reign of Constantine the Great, the British church greatly flourished. There were three English bishops present at the council of Arles, which was assembled by that emperor against the Donatists in the year A.D. 314; and the manner in which that council communicated its canons to the bishop of Rome, proves that the representatives of the churches there assembled esteemed themselves independent of his authority. They tell him that certain matters were settled, and inform him in order that he might make them public, which is rather the language of authority than obedience. British bishops were likewise present at the council of Sardica, in Thrace, A.D. 347, and at Arinum, in Italy, A.D. 359. At this latter council, it is related that only three of them received the allowance made by the emperor, which is at once a proof of the number and independence of the British bishops present at that council.

That the British church was independent is, however, fully proved by the many ecclesiastical councils held in Britain at this period. It seems clear that many diocesan synods and provincial councils were held during this period; but learning was at such a low ebb, that many events occurred of which no record was made, and the memory of which passed away with the generation by whom they were witnessed. The first council held in Britain of which any record is extant was held at Verulamium, or St. Albans, A.D. 446. This was the result of the introduction of Pelagianism, which took place at that time, and which filled the church with tumult and distraction. This heresy was widely diffused in Britain by Agricola, son of Severeianus, a bishop, and so strongly were its advocates fortified with arguments, or so weakly were they opposed, that the British divines were compelled to call in the aid of Germanus, a Gallican bishop. He was accompanied by Lupus, another prelate, and according to Bede, by their learning and eloquence they convinced the British bishops and all present at the debate of the heresy of the views of Pelagius. Bede gravely relates that the devil was so deeply offended with Germanus for his defeat of Pelagius, that he laid a snare for him on his preparing to return into Gaul, a snare into which the saint fell and strained his foot! But this was ill-judged malice. Germanus had worked some great miracles before, and he now wrought many more, to the discomfiture of both the devil and his friends. One of his miracles appears to have been the defeat of the Picts and Scots, for those enemies happening to appear while Germanus was thus retained in Britain, he put himself, says Bede, at the head of the British army, and by merely crying out "Hallelujah!" as he advanced against them, they were totally and shamefully defeated! After this, Germanus and Lupus set sail for Gaul, and were rewarded by a safe and pleasant passage for their spiritual and temporal victories. But the Pelagian heresy, notwithstanding, was not yet uprooted. Its advocates were still untiring in their efforts to propagate it, and the British church again took an active part in checking its errors. Another council was held in A.D. 449, and the clergy again applied to Germanus to undertake the task of refuting them. In his second visit to Britain, Germanus was accompanied by Severus, bishop of Treves, and he was once more successful in his mission. As the best means of putting an effectual stop to the heresy, Germanus seems to have attempted to introduce the study of sound learning and theology into Britain. Some writers have supposed that the monastery of Banchor, near Chester, which was furnished with learned men at the coming of Augustine into England, was established at this time; but it would rather appear that it was established in the previous century, for it was at that time that the monks, or regular clergy, who in after years made a conspicuous figure in the Christian church, first made their appearance in Europe.

These particulars concerning the early British church are meagre, but at the same time interesting to all who feel pleasure in tracing its history from its primary establishment in our island. In forming an

estimate of the state of religion, however, at this early period, the state of the country must be taken into consideration. And as previous pages unfold, that state was not of an ordinary character. When the Romans deserted Britain, it became a prey to the ravages of the Picts and Scots, so that the church could neither enjoy peace nor prosperity. As before recorded, their invasions were so fearful that the South Britons called in the Saxons to their aid, and they, as will be seen in a future page, overturned both the ecclesiastical and civil government of the country, and finally drove the Britons into Wales.

——"Afflicted and dismayed,
The relics of the sword flee to the mountains.
O wretched land! whose tears have flowed like fountains;
Whose arts and honours in the dust are laid
By men yet scarcely conscious of a care,
For other monuments than those of earth;
Who, as the fields and woods have given them birth,
Will build their savage fortunes only there,
Content if foss and barrow, and the girth
Of long-drawn rampart witness what they were."—WORDSWORTH.

CHAPTER IV.

The History of Literature, Science, and Art from B.C. 55 to A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

It has been observed that "nothing in the early existence of Britain indicated the greatness which she was destined to attain." But it must not be supposed that in its early existence it was peopled by mere savages. Roman writers bear testimony that the ancient Britons were a people impatient of restraint, fond of liberty, warlike, laborious, fierce, imperious, ingenious, and high-spirited; and such a people cannot therefore be looked upon as wholly barbarian, or classed with the Red Indians of North America, or the savages of whom we read in Africa, New Zealand, and Australasia. On the contrary, there are proofs that they possessed some learning, and practised the arts of civilization, although they might, when compared with their invaders, the Romans, be considered at least semi-barbaric.

It is clear that when the Romans invaded Britain, learning had become in some degree an object of importance. A glimmering, at least, of the light of science existed among the ancient Britons. As before stated, the Druids were not only priests but philosophers likewise. It would appear, indeed, that they were supported in honour and affluence at the public expense, that they might devote their lives to the study of learning and religion. What Ammianus Marcellinus says of the inhabitants and Druids of Gaul, is equally applicable to those of Britain. "The inhabitants of Gaul," he says, "having been by degrees a little polished, the study of some branches of useful learning was introduced among them by the Bards, the Vates, and the Druids. The Vates made researches into the order of things, and endeavoured to lay open the most hidden secrets of nature. The Druids were men of a still more sublime and penetrating spirit, and acquired the highest renown by their speculations, which were at once subtle and lofty." There was, no doubt, much groping in the dark after knowledge to little purpose; but that the Druids were diligent students, and that they had made considerable progress in learning before they were swept away by the Romans, is evident from the respectful terms in which both Greek and Roman writers speak of their learning. It is recorded by Cæsar and Mela that their systems of astronomy and philosophy were so comprehensive, and their learning so varied, that their scholars spent twenty years under their tuition before they could make themselves masters of all their Druidical educators could teach them.

It would be impossible to settle the vexed question as to whether the Druids were the inventors of their systems of religion and philosophy, or received them from others; but it seems probable that they were their own in substance, although they may have borrowed hints and embellishments from the systems of Greek and other philosophers. Their philosophy resembled that of Pythagoras more than that of any other sage of antiquity; but as that famous philosopher travelled into many countries in search of knowledge, he is as likely to have derived some of his opinions from the Druids as they from him. It is, indeed, expressly asserted by several ancient writers that Pythagoras heard the Druids of Gaul, and was initiated into their philosophy. In this, however, he must have been highly favoured, for it was a fixed rule among the Druids to conceal their principles and opinions from all the world except the members of their own society. Hence it is, combined with a law which forbade them to commit any of their doctrines to writing, that so little is known of the tenets of their philosophy.

The favourite study of the Druids, both of Gaul and Britain, was that of physiology, or natural philosophy. Ancient writers state that they entered into many disquisitions and disputations in their schools concerning the power and magnitude of the universe in general, and of this earth in particular, and even concerning the most sublime and hidden secrets of nature. A variety of systems and hypotheses were formed by the Druids on these and other subjects; but we have only here and there a stray passage in the writings of ancient authors by which any clue can be obtained to their opinions. That concerning the universe according to Strabo was that it was never to be annihilated, but was to undergo a succession of changes and revolutions, sometimes to be effected by the agency of water, and at others by fire. This was the opinion of most ancient philosophers of all nations, and was probably derived from their common ances

tors of the family of Noah, though corrupted and misunderstood by lapse of time. It was evidently derived from tradition, for no human intellect could unaided have formed such an opinion on the grand consummation of all things. What their opinions were about the power of God, of which Cæsar says they had many disquisitions, is unknown; indeed, although the fame of the learning of the Druids has survived them, the merest fragments of that learning have been handed down to posterity.

Another of the chief studies of the Druids was that of astronomy. "They profess," says Mela, "to have great knowledge of the motions of the heavens and the stars." The science of astronomy appears to have been blended with their religion. It was cultivated by them in the belief that it would afford them the means of looking into futurity. By the motions and aspects of the heavenly bodies, according to Mela, they pretended to discover the counsels and designs of the gods. Astronomy was also studied for the regulation of their festivals. According to Pliny, the Druids had a cycle, or period of thirty years, which they called an age, and which commenced on the sixth day of the moon, as did also the reckoning of their months and years. On what principles this cycle was formed, however, or to what purposes it was applied, there is no direct information. Diodorus Siculus speaks of the cycle of nineteen years, called the cycle of the moon, as the great regulator of the national religious calendar. Concerning the Hyperboreans, which is believed by some to be the Britons, he says, that "they believe Apollo descends into their island at the end of every nineteen years, in which period of time the sun and moon having performed their various revolutions, return to the same point, and begin to repeat the same revolutions." By some authors the Druids are supposed to have discovered that the moon was not the fountain of her own light, but that she shone with rays borrowed from the sun; and that they were not unacquainted with the periods of the revolutions of the planets. Plutarch, indeed, distinctly states "that the inhabitants of the British isles kept every thirtieth year a solemn festival in honour of Saturn, when his star entered into the sign of Taurus." From this it would appear that the Druids were acquainted with the constellations, and the signs of the zodiac; and that they measured the revolutions of the sun and planets by observing the length of time between their departure and return to one of these signs. In making their observations on the heavenly bodies it has been imagined that they were assisted by optical instruments. This conjecture is formed from an expression of Diodorus Siculus, in which he says, "that the moon is reported to be seen from that island as if she was but a little distance from the earth, having hills or mountains like ours on her surface." The same author, however, gravely relates that the people of Spain "heard the hissing noise of the sun every evening when he fell into the Western Ocean." It is more likely that the Druids taught the science of astronomy to their pupils by some species of astronomical rather than optical instrument. A curious relic has been discovered in Ireland, of Celtic origin, which is supposed to have been the instrument used by them. It is described by Sir William Betham as "a circle, the outside of which represents the moon's orbit, having on it eight rings, representing the different phases of the moon. In the inside of this circle is another, fixed on an axis in the line of the inclination of the poles, on which this, which represents the earth, traverses." The instrument is a rude one, but it was well calculated to aid the teacher in his illustrations of the heavenly bodies.



ASTRONOMICAL INSTRUMENT.

Other branches of learning among the Druids were arithmetic and geometry. These sciences were, indeed, the natural concomitants of philosophy and astronomy. Pythagoras is said to have taught his disciples all truth by the study of arithmetic, and the Druids no doubt employed the same agency in the instruction of their pupils. In their calculations they are supposed to have made use of the letters of the Greek alphabet, Arabic characters being then unknown; but as all their instructions were given orally in verse, it is probable that both the science of arithmetic and geometry were taught in the same manner. That the Druids had early made considerable progress in geometry is evident; for Cæsar records that when any dispute arose about inheritances, or the limits of fields, they were entirely referred to their decision. In like manner they would have to settle all disputes about the boundaries of states, from which it may reasonably be concluded that they possessed a knowledge of geography, at least of their own island. It is even probable that the geographical knowledge of the British Druids extended much farther than their own island; especially when it is considered that they were in constant communication with their own order on the Continent.

As the Druids were the priests and lawgivers among the Britons, so were they also their physicians. In the northern nations of this period the art of healing was intrusted to old women; in Gaul and Britain to the Druids. It was supposed that they only could cure diseases; not so much by their wisdom and learning as by their priestly functions; for it was a prevailing opinion among the ancients that all diseases proceeded from the anger of the gods, and that the only way of obtaining a cure was by applying to their priests to appease their anger by religious rites and sacrifices. From this it may be gathered that the medical skill of the Druids was

a medley of theology, astrology, divination, and magic. Cæsar intimates that in some instances, when the case was a dangerous one, the life of one man was sacrificed to procure the health of another, that being supposed to be the only way by which the anger of the gods could be appeased. Vegetable productions were used by the Druids in their art of healing, but they placed very little reliance upon their virtues. It is true that it is recorded they esteemed the misletoe grown on an

MISLETOE PLANT.

oak to be a remedy for all diseases; but its healing virtue depended entirely upon the manner in which it was severed from the parent tree. If gathered in the manner before described, it was a sovereign remedy for all diseases, but if it touched the earth after it was cut by the Druids' golden knife its healing virtue was lessened, if not entirely destroyed. It was so, also, with the selago, a kind of hedge hyssop, a plant supposed to possess medicinal virtues for all complaints of the eye. The selago was to be gathered by a person clothed in a white robe, having his feet bare, and washed in pure water. Before he gathered it he was to offer sacrifice of bread and wine; and it was to be cut with his right hand covered with the skirt of his garment, with a hook of some more precious metal than iron. This alone could make it efficacious. It was then not only a potent medicine, but a charm able to preserve its possessors from misfortune and accidents. Then, again, the herb samolus, or marsh-wort, was to be gathered by a person fasting, with his left hand; and when he was gathering it he was neither to look behind him nor to turn his face from it, otherwise its sanative qualities would be lost. It was thus with the whole of the materia medica of the Druids. If the precious plants they employed in their art of healing were not gathered according to some prescribed ritual, or minute formalities, then it was considered they possessed no healing virtues. But it may be suspected that these formalities were designed for a twofold purpose—to impress a sanctity on the art of healing, and to afford a shelter for the physician's credit when the drugs he administered failed to effect a cure. In the midst of all this delusion and imposture, however, it seems certain that the Druids possessed some real knowledge of the healing virtues existing in plants. Living as they did in the recesses of mountains, groves, and woods, in which the spontaneous vegetable productions of the earth constantly presented themselves to their view, they could not fail to discover that they did not grow in vain; that they were intended for the mitigation of the ills of life. According to Pliny's Natural History, indeed, they possessed certain methods of preparing medicines; sometimes extracting the juices of herbs and plants by bruising and steeping them in cold water; at others, by infusing them in wine; and at others, making potions and decoctions by boiling them in water or other liquors. Pliny also intimates that they occasionally administered them in the way of fumigation; that sometimes they dried the leaves, stalks, and roots, and afterwards infused them; and that they even made salves and ointments of vegetable plants.

The influence which eloquence has over the human mind is proverbial. Oratory has often changed the fate both of individuals and nations. It was by this art which the Druids cultivated diligently, that they swayed the public mind of the ancient Britons. The Druids, says Mela, were great masters and teachers of eloquence. Many harangues have been preserved by Roman writers which are said to have been delivered by them; and if these harangues have not been adorned by their transcribers, they possess great merit. Marvellous tales are told of the effects of their eloquence. By its powers they could raise the courage of combatants in battle, or could so appease their mutual rage as to cause them to throw down their arms and be at peace. Instances of the effects of their eloquence have been given in previous pages; and although it is not expressly mentioned, it may well be supposed that the courage of the heroine Boadicea was inflamed by Druidical prophetic eloquence. But it was not in war only that the Druids exercised their powers of oratory; but in the administration of the laws, the education of youth, and their discourses to the people on moral and religious subjects. According to Lucian, one of the deities of the Druids was named Ogmius, signifying eloquence, who was worshipped with great devotion as the patron of orators. The art of oratory was taught by them to their pupils, and especially to the British kings and chieftains, who were often eloquent orators, if, at least, the harangues ascribed to them by Greek and Roman writers are genuine. Tacitus bears express testimony to the eloquence of the ancient British chieftains; and it is certain that their posterity long retained a taste for oratory, and held those who excelled in that noble art in high esteem.

Concerning the knowledge of letters among the British Druids, very little is known. It is certain, however, that they did possess that knowledge. The very law which existed among them, prohibiting their doctrines from being committed to writing, is an evidence that they were acquainted with letters; for if they were ignorant of the art of writing, where would have been the necessity of such a prohibition? Cæsar, indeed, expressly states that in all affairs except those of religion and learning, letters were used by them, and that their letters were those of the Greek alphabet. It would appear that this knowledge was derived from a Greek colony at Marseilles, for Strabo says that all the people of neighbouring nations who were of a liberal and studious disposition

went thither to apply to the study of learning and philosophy. He adds that the Gauls wrote their contracts and legal deeds in Greek letters; and the Druids of Britain may either have received their knowledge of Greek letters from the Greek merchants of Marseilles, who traded in Britain, or from the Druids of Gaul. At the same time it seems probable that the letters used by the Druids in Britain, although they resembled those of the Greek alphabet, were not altogether identical; for Cæsar is said to have sent his despatches to Gaul written in the Greek language, that the Britons, if they fell into their hands, might not understand them. If they were identical, it would appear from this that if the Druids had a perfect knowledge of the Greek alphabet their knowledge did not extend to the Greek language. The dead languages, indeed, formed no part of the study of the ancient Britons, for their knowledge was derived from men rather than books, from conversation rather than from reading.

Mention has been made that the Druids of Britain were the educators of youth. Their academies—if they may be so called—were like their temples, in the deepest recesses of woods and forests. Wherever there was a temple, there appears to have been a seat of learning. Some of these were crowded with students—Britons and Gauls—especially that presided over by the Archdruid in the Isle of Anglesey. Monkish legend speaks of two universities founded by Brutus the Trojan near Oxford; but this is mere legend. There are no means of ascertaining where the seats of learning were situated among the ancient Britons, and all that is known of their constitution, or of the manner in which the sciences were taught is, that the course of education comprehended the whole circle of sciences as then known; and that these sciences were taught orally in verse. That course is said to have consisted of twenty thousand verses; and if any of the pupils of the Druids committed such a number of verses to memory, or if any Druid could teach such a number from memory, both pupil and teacher must have been prodigies of learning.

For a series of years after the Roman conquest, the state of learning in Britain remained the same as when Cæsar first set foot in our island. The first Roman governor who interested himself in the improvement of education in Britain was the renowned Agricola. He it was who introduced the Roman arts and sciences among the youth of Britain, conceiving it to be one of the most powerful means of reconciling them to the government of Rome. With the same view he persuaded them to learn the Latin language and to study the Roman art of eloquence. Little progress was made at first in the study of the Latin language. By degrees, however, it became popular: Mela says that the Roman poets were early read in Britain; and Gildas asserts that the Latin language was so generally understood and spoken at a later period that Britain might more properly have been called a Roman than a British island. Schools were everywhere established, and teachers provided to impart instruction. There are still extant many imperial edicts respecting the seminaries of provincial Britain. There can, indeed, be no question that the Latin language was generally used by the more educated classes, for it was the language in which all their municipal regulations were conducted. It appears, also, to have been widely diffused among the people. It could not, indeed, be otherwise, for the intercourse between the Romans and Britons made a knowledge of that language an indispensable requisite. Greek, also, was taught in the schools of Britain. That language was admired and studied in all the provinces of the western empire, and Greek grammarians were employed in all their chief cities to instruct their youth in that elegant branch of learning. If the pages of Juvenal may be relied upon, there appears to have been a greater amount of care taken in the education of the youth of the provinces than of the youth of Rome itself. This, however, may be accounted for by the fact that in Rome it was chiefly a military education, a system which would not have been suffered to exist in the provinces. It was there a counterpart of the system of government. Thus Juvenal writes:—

"But, oh! what stock of patience wants the fool,
Who wastes his time and breath in teaching school!
To hear the speeches of declaiming boys
Deposing tyrants with eternal noise!
Sitting or standing still confined to roar
In the same verse the same rules o'er and o'er:
What kind the speech, what colours, how to purge
Objections, state the case, and reasons urge.
All would learn these; but at the quarter-day,
Few parents will the pedant's labour pay.
Pay, sir! for what? The scholar knows no more
At six months' end than what he knew before:
Taught or untaught, the dunce is still the same,
Yet, still the wretched master bears the blame.
Once every week poor Hannibal is maul'd;
The theme is given and straight the council's call'd,
Whether he should to Rome directly go
To reap the fruit of the dire overthrow,
Or into quarters put his harass'd men,
Till spring returns and take the field again.
The murdered master cries 'Would parents hear
But half that stuff which I am bound to hear,
For that revenge I'll quit the whole arrear.'"

At Rome, learning and the arts were considered of minor importance compared with conquest. It is a remarkable fact that the Romans as a people cannot lay claim to intellectual merit. A few great men in literature appeared among them, as Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and Lucan, but these formed the exception rather than the rule. In the very best age, indeed, Roman literature was exotic: that is, it was derived from Greece. Thus Horace writes:—

"When conquered Greece brought in her captive arts,
She triumphed o'er her savage conquerors' hearts:
Taught our rough verse its numbers to refine,
And our rude style with eloquence to shine."

According to Martial, the Roman poets were read in Britain during this period, but it appears that the branches of study chiefly inculcated were rhetoric and philosophy. Mathematics was almost a proscribed study. At all events in the fourth and fifth centuries many edicts were issued against mathematicians, they being considered magicians and enchanters, or men who imposed upon the credulity of the people. Other branches of study were medicine

and law, more especially the latter. Many of the British youth applied to the study of the Roman laws for the purpose of becoming pleaders, and, according to Juvenal, it was customary for them to finish their education for the bar in some of the public schools of Gaul.

Of Roman literature in Britain during this period but little is known. There is, indeed, scarcely a British name of any literary reputation on record. This is probably owing to the ravages of the Picts and Scots, and the subsequent devastations of the Saxons. The names of those mentioned as having figured in the Christian Church are Sylvius Bonus, St. Ninian, St. Patrick, Pelagius, and Celestius; but of the writings of these authors few have escaped the wreck of time. It is evident, however, that some of these had considerable reputation in their day as Latin authors. Pelagius and Celestius especially gained for themselves an unenviable notoriety for the promulgation of heretical opinions—opinions which, despite the writings of many learned fathers and the decrees of councils against them, spread widely throughout the provinces both of the eastern and western empire.

SECTION II.

THE first object of the art and industry of mankind in all countries and in all ages of the world is to procure food for the sustenance of life. In some parts of Britain its ancient inhabitants chiefly lived on the flesh and milk of their herds; while in others, and especially in the interior, they subsisted by hunting and fishing. The hunter chased the hart and the boar, and the bear, with small, lean, and shaggy dogs, swift of foot, and possessed of matchless scent; while the fisherman in his coracle rowed swiftly with one hand, and managed his line with the other, just as the dwellers on the Wye fish at the present day.

But while some of the ancient Britons subsisted in this primitive manner, there were others more civilized who grew corn for their sustenance. This was more especially the case in the southern districts. Cæsar says that the seacoasts were inhabited by colonies from Belgium who began to cultivate the soil; and Tacitus expressly states that these colonists were encouraged to pursue that mode of life by the fertility of the soil, which produced all kinds of grain in great abundance and perfection. And that they possessed some knowledge of the art of agriculture is clear from Pliny, who records that they manured their ground with a fat clay or earth, called marl; white marl being esteemed by them as the most valuable. Their instruments of husbandry, however, were of a very primitive character, for in tilling their lands they merely scratched it with a rude plough, or dug it with a mattock. According to Diodorus Siculus they reaped their corn by cutting the ears from the stubble, after which they stored it up in subterraneous chambers or granaries. With the flail they were wholly unacquainted, for the same author says that when they had housed their corn, they took a certain quantity from their granaries every day, and after drying and bruising the corn beaten out they made food for immediate use. These methods were practised by many other nations beside the Britons, and vestiges of this ancient usage existed in the western isles of Scotland up to a recent period. In his description of these isles, Martin says:—"A woman sitting down takes a handful of corn, holding it by the stalks in her left hand, and then sets fire to the ears, which are presently in a flame. She has a stick in her right hand, which she manages with much dexterity, beating off the grain the instant the husk is quite burnt, for if she miss of that she must use the kiln. The corn may be so dressed, winnowed, ground, and baked within an hour."

Under the Romans the agriculture of Britain was greatly improved and extended. It was an art in which the Romans delighted, and which they encouraged in all the provinces of the empire. Cato says: "When the Romans designed to bestow the highest praise on a good man they used to say he understands agriculture well, and is an excellent husbandman, for this was esteemed the greatest and most honourable character." As soon, therefore, as the Romans subdued any of the British states they induced their new subjects to cultivate their lands, in order to render their conquests more valuable. Tribes who had lived on the produce of the chase and fishing, under the Romans became agriculturists. In a little time the island not only produced sufficient corn for the support of its own population, but afforded annually a considerable surplus for exportation. The growth of corn in Britain became an object of so much importance to the Romans that a fleet of ships was built for its transportation to Rome and the other provinces. An evidence of the fertility of Britain is furnished by a remarkable fact recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus in the fourth century. The Emperor Julian, he says, built new granaries in the room of those which had been burnt by the enemy into which he might store corn derived from Britain, a fleet of eight hundred ships being employed to fetch it from thence. This fleet made several voyages for that purpose during the year A.D. 359; and the quantity supplied from our fertile island may be inferred from the fact that it was sufficient to support the starving Rhenish provinces desolated by war during the winter to sow their lands in the spring, and to maintain them to the harvest of A.D. 360. The production of such an abundance of corn in Britain arose not only from bringing lands into cultivation, but also from an improved state of husbandry. The Britons no longer scratched the earth in its cultivation, but used the "crooked plough" with an eight-feet beam mentioned in the Georgics of Virgil. That poet gives these instructions to the husbandman for the construction of a plough:—

> "Young elms, with early force in copses bow,
> Fit for the figures of the crooked plough,
> Of eight feet long a fastened beam prepare:
> On either side the head produce an ear,
> And sink a socket for the shining share.
> Of beech the ploughtail and the bending yoke,
> Or softer linden hardened in the smoke."

A coulter similar to that used in our own country was inserted into the pole, so as to depend vertically before the share, cutting through the roots which

came in its way, and thus preparing for the more effective operation of the share. A malleus, or beetle, made of wood, was used to break and pulverise the clods after the seed was sown, and sometimes harrows were used for that purpose. To this practice Virgil thus alludes:

"Nor is the profit small the peasant makes
Who smooths with harrows or who pounds with rakes
The crumbling clods: nor Ceres from on high
Regards his labours with a grudging eye;
Nor his who ploughs across the furrowed grounds,
And on the back of earth inflicts new wounds!
For he, with frequent exercise commands
The unwilling soil, and tames the stubborn lands."

The Romans not only practised themselves—for their legions were as expert in guiding the plough as in wielding the sword—but they instructed the Britons in all the branches of agriculture. Before the Conquest their herbs and fruits were such only as grew wild in the fields and the woods; but when the Romans had settled in Britain they planted orchards and cultivated gardens. Tacitus says they found by experience that the soil and climate were adapted for all kinds of fruit trees, except the vine and the olive; and for all kinds of vegetables, except a few which were peculiar to hotter climates. Subsequently it was discovered that some parts of the country were adapted for vineyards; for about A.D. 278 permission was obtained from the Emperor Probus to plant vines and make wine. Provincial Britain seems, indeed, to have been better cultivated under the dominion of the Romans than it was for many centuries after that dominion had ceased.

The architecture of the ancient Britons was of a very primitive character. "Why," asked Caractacus, when led captive through the streets of Rome, "why do ye who possess such numerous and durable edifices covet our humble cottages?" It is very probable that some of the ruder tribes of Britain had, like the Germans, no better dwelling-places than thickets, dens, or caves. Even their cottages were of the most primitive construction, the most durable consisting only of boughs interwoven and covered with clay. Cæsar says that on the southern coasts, or the shores of Kent, houses were numerous, and very much resembled those of Gaul; and those of Gaul are described by Strabo as being constructed of wattled work, in the form of a circle, with lofty tapering or pointed roofs. The foundations of some of these circular houses were of stone, especially among the tribes who had intercourse with the Gauls; but they were of equally rude construction as the wattled houses of the interior. The entrance appears to have been arched, and at the top or centre was an aperture for the egress of smoke and the admission of light. There was nothing among them answering to our ideas of a city or town. "What the Britons call a town," says Cæsar, "is a tract of woody country surrounded by a mound and ditch for the security of themselves and their cattle against the incursions of their enemies." Strabo, also observes: "The forests of Britain are their cities, for when they have enclosed a large circuit with felled trees, they build in it houses for themselves and hovels for their cattle. These buildings are very slight, and not designed for long duration." The towns of the ancient Britons were, indeed, military posts or camps, specimens of which still exist on the Malvern Hills and in Epping Forest. Yet, ignorant as the ancient Britons were of architecture, one stupendous monument is ascribed to them, which not only displays a high degree of architectural skill, but proves that they must have lifted the huge stones of which it is composed from the quarry, and hoisted and disposed of them in their still existing marvellous form, by the application of the principle of the lever. That fabric is the far-famed Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain—a fabric which has survived all the noble structures erected in our island by the Romans.

SUPPOSED FORM OF ANCIENT BRITISH HOUSE.

A great change took place in architecture when the Romans had established themselves in Britain. In the earliest ages of their history their houses had been usually built of wood, or unbaked bricks, and covered with thatch or shingles; but when wealth had been acquired by conquest, their dwellings were not only built of stone, and of immense size, but adorned with columns, paintings, statues, and costly works of art. And with such buildings as were erected at Rome, the Romans adorned every country they conquered. When Camalodunum was destroyed in the great revolt under Boadicea, it was a town of no mean extent, adorned with statues, temples, theatres, and other public edifices. The temple of Claudius was of such an immense size that it contained the whole garrison who took shelter in it; and so strong that it withstood a siege of two days against the infuriated Britons. That Roman architecture made rapid progress in Britain is evidenced by the erection of Londinium, or London. At the time of the first Roman invasion there was no town in that place, or if there was, it was only an entrenched camp; but in about sixteen years after it fell into the hands of the conquerors, it became a rich, populous, and beautiful

Roman-built city. Every principal town of Roman Britain was adorned with temples, courts of justice, theatres, statues, monuments, and other public buildings. On this subject, Sir Francis Palgrave remarks: "The country was replete with the monuments of Roman magnificence. Malmesbury appeals to these stately ruins as testimonies of the favour which Britain enjoyed: the towers, the temples, the theatres, and the baths which yet remained undestroyed, excited the wonder and admiration of the chronicler and the traveller; and even in the fourteenth century the edifices raised by the Romans were so numerous and costly as almost to excel any others on this side the Alps. Nor were these structures among the least influential means of establishing the Roman power. Architecture, as cultivated by the ancients, was not merely presented to the eye, the art spoke also to the mind The walls covered with the decrees of the legislature engraved on bronze, or sculptured in marble; the triumphal arches crowned by the statues of the princes who governed the provinces from the distant Quirinal; the tessellated floor pictured with the mythology of the state whose sovereign was its pontiff, all contributed to act upon the feelings of the people, and to impress them with respect and submission. The conquerors shared in the fame, and were exalted by the splendour of their victors." And the Romans not only erected magnificent structures for themselves, they excited and assisted the Britons to imitate their example. Agricola, says Tacitus, exhorted them to build houses, temples, courts, and market-places; and it is certain that, from his time to the middle of the fourth century, all the arts connected with architecture flourished in Britain. The same taste was displayed for erecting solid, convenient, and beautiful buildings which had so long prevailed in Italy. In the third century our island had become famous for the number and excellence of its architects and artificers. When Constantius rebuilt the city of Autun in Gaul, his artificers were chiefly those whom he had brought with him from Britain, they being, according to Eumenius, the most skilled workmen of the age.

ROMAN ARCH, LINCOLN.

All that remains, however, of these once proud edifices are some fragments of foundations and tessellated pavements, which are now and then discovered, and which by their extent show the degree to which the art of Roman architecture was introduced into Britain. Vestiges of Roman walls, however, by which the cities were surrounded still exist in London, York, Lincoln, Chichester, Exeter, Chester, and Colchester; and at Richborough, which was a military colony, a wall of solid masonry twelve feet thick, and from twenty to thirty feet high, still stands in its solitary magnificence, testifying to all who behold it of the greatness of the Roman power in Britain.

Little is known of the manufactures of the ancient Britons. Cæsar says that those living in the interior of the country were clothed in skins, that is, a skin of some of the larger animals was thrown over their shoulders like a mantle. But that the art of manufacturing articles for clothing was known at least by the natives on the southern coasts, before Cæsar came into Britain, there can be no question. Those natives could not so long have had intercourse with the Phœnicians and the Greeks of Marseilles without becoming acquainted with the arts of dressing, spinning, and weaving both flax and wool. Their knowledge of these arts may have been imperfect; but it seems clear that both the Gauls and Britons manufactured several kinds of woollen cloths, of two or three of which they appear to have been the inventors. The Belgæ especially, both on the Continent and in Britain, made warm woollen plaids or mantles for winter, and others of a finer texture, woven chequer-wise, which made it fall into small squares, of which they made their summer mantles and other garments. Some of the southern Britons appear even to have been acquainted with the art of dyeing cloth, and of making and bleaching linen. Herbs used by them for dyeing are mentioned by Pliny; that of the glastum, or *woad*, with which it had anciently been the custom to paint or stain their bodies with a deep blue, being chiefly used for that purpose.

It was not, however, till after the settlement of the Romans in the island that any of these arts were brought to great perfection. The art of weaving was in great repute at Rome. There was not only a distinct class of persons who worked at the loom, but in every domestic establishment, especially in the country, the art of weaving was carried on by female slaves, under the superintendence of the mistress of the house, assisted by her daughters. This was especially the custom in early times; but when luxury spread its baneful influence over the society of Rome, weaving was chiefly left to the artist. The art was readily taught by the Romans to all the subjects of the empire; and it was when the Britons owned their sway that it flourished in Britain. The Roman Emperors were at great pains to preserve the most skilful artificers of all kinds, and especially the best manufacturers of woollen and linen cloths. Colleges, or corporations of such manufacturers, were formed by them, and settled in the most convenient places of the empire. These colleges were under the direction of an officer, called the "Count of the Sacred Largesses," and every particular college was governed by a procurator. They were established for the use of the

Emperor, his court, and his armies; and such a college, according to the Notitia Imperii, existed at Venta Bulgarium, now Winchester. But if these colleges did not manufacture for the use of the population, the knowledge of their arts became universal throughout the island.

There is no direct information concerning what knowledge the ancient Britons possessed of the carpenters' and joiners' arts. As they knew how to make the implements of husbandry; and as the weaver must have been supplied with distaff, spindle, and other instruments, those arts must have been practised by them. Indeed, if what Greek and Roman writers say of their war-chariots is correct—that they were of an elegant construction—some, at least, among the Britons must have possessed considerable skill in the arts of working wood. But it was after the Conquest that the Britons became celebrated for these arts; for the Fabri, or carpenters of Rome, had long excelled in them—using many of the tools which are used by our skilled workmen of the present day. Thus Pollux mentions a chip-axe or adze, a wood-cutting axe, a gimlet; a boring instrument with a handle, pincers, a plane, a saw, a file, a chisel: and Pliny adds to the list the perpendicular, glue, the level, rule, and lathe. With the trade of joiners the carpenters of Rome united veneering, staining wood, and inlaying; in all of which the Britons appear to have been instructed, and to have become skilful.

As regards the arts of refining and working metals, there is evidence to show that the ancient Britons had considerable knowledge of them long before the Roman invasion. In remote times they may have made the heads of their axes, spears, arrows, and other implements of flints, but at this period they were acquainted with the art of working several metals, as tin, lead, brass or copper, and iron. Britain abounded in the two former metals, and they had long been articles of commerce; but, according to Cæsar, the brass or copper used by the Britons was imported. It is probable that it was obtained from the Phœnicians in exchange for lead and tin; but from whatever quarter it was received, it is certain that they understood the art of working it into various shapes. Axes, swords, spear-heads, and arrow-heads, made of copper, and known among antiquarians by the general name of *Celts*, have been found from time to time in great numbers in various parts of Britain. Iron appears to have been used chiefly at the time of Cæsar's invasion in the manufactures of coins for barter, and trinkets for adorning the persons of the Britons; but the Romans subsequently established imperial foundries for smelting iron, and noble forges for the manufacture of arms, tools, and a variety of other articles.

It was during their dominion that the mines of Britain were turned to the most profitable account. Tacitus expressly states that the abundance of metals in Britain was the prize of the conquerors. Then it was that the tin-mines of Cornwall and the lead-mines of Derbyshire—concerning which the ancient Britons had made a law that only a certain quantity should be wrought annually—were systematically worked and became valuable. And that the mining and smelting of iron was carried on by the Romans to a great extent is proved by the fact, that in the seventeenth century the hearth of a Roman furnace was discovered at Worcester, and many thousand tons of cinders were carried away, which being but imperfectly smelted, yielded iron. An enormous cinder heap is spoken of as having existed in Birmingham from the Roman period; and there is also a Roman iron district in the Forest of Dean and its neighbourhood, from which, as recently as A.D. 1852, ironstone has been dug, and in which Roman coins have been discovered. Tacitus mentions the occurrence of precious metals. "Britain," he says, "produceth silver, gold, and other metals to reward its conquerors;" and that the ancient Britons were acquainted with the existence of the precious metals is clear from history. The Druids cut their misletoe from the oak with a "golden knife," and wore a "golden egg" round their necks; and the Romans boast of having taken a great number of "golden chains" from the patriotic Caractacus, which were taken in triumph to Rome. The remains of ancient workings at the Ogofan mines in Cærmarthenshire, with gold ornaments discovered, lead to the conclusion that it was wrought by the Romans. It must not, however, be understood that the Romans worked the mines of Britain, or of any other province of the empire, in person: on the contrary, every mine—except those of gold, which were wrought at the expense and for the profit of the emperor—belonged to proprietors, who paid a proportion of their profits—probably a tenth—to the state. In some Roman provinces the revenue derived from mines was immense, and there is reason to believe that those in Britain were among the most valuable.

The art of manufacturing earthenware appears in some degree to have been understood by the ancient Britons. Urns of earthenware, supposed to have been of their workmanship, have been discovered in barrows in various parts of Britain by the antiquarian. So also have drinking cups, which were used in life and placed at the head and feet at death; and incense cups, supposed to have been filled with perfumes and suspended over the funeral pile. The earthenware, however, of the ancient Britons was of a rude character: composed of coarse materials and imperfectly baked, and hence liable to crack when exposed to the weather. The Romans were famous for their manufacture of earthenware, and the vestiges of several of their potteries still exist. From numerous articles of glass manufacture found at Pompeii, it is manifest that the Romans possessed great taste in this art, and there can be no doubt that this, with all the other useful arts with which they were acquainted, was taught by them to the Britons. Brick-making in Britain during their dominion must have been carried on very extensively; for brick was chiefly employed in their buildings. It seems probable that the buildings of Londinium were erected with brick, which may account for the non-existence of any remains of its stately palaces, towers, temples, and theatres, with which it is said to have been adorned. Those of Verulamium clearly were; for the square tower of the church of St. Alban's is built with Roman bricks taken from its ruins.

SECTION III.

THE preceding section treats of the useful arts of ancient and Roman Britain: in this we shall briefly treat of the fine arts, as sculpture, painting, poetry, and music.

The ancient Britons appear to have been utterly ignorant of the arts of casting figures of metals or of cutting them on stones. It was against the principles of their religion to make statues or images of their gods. Such works of art in Britain are not even mentioned by Roman writers; and hence it may be concluded that they formed no part of their study or practice. No sooner, however, was the authority of the Druids destroyed, and that of the Romans established, than statues were introduced on every hand into temples and houses. Statuary was a much cultivated art in Rome. That art had been anciently borrowed by them from the Etruscans, the Orientals, and the Greeks, and so much was it cultivated, that at this period not only Rome abounded with statues, but every important city throughout the empire. Their passion for sculpture is well illustrated by Virgil in thus complimenting Augustus:—

"High o'er the gate, in elephant and gold,
The crowd shall Cæsar's Indian war behold:
The Nile shall flow beneath, and on the side
His shattered ships on brazen pillars ride.
Next him Niphates with inverted urn
And dropping sedge shall his Armenian mourn,
And Asian cities in our triumph borne.
With backward bows the Parthian shall be there,
And, spurring from the fight, confess their fear.
A double wreath shall crown *our* Cæsar's brows,—
Two different trophies from two different foes.
Europe with Africa in his fame shall join,
But neither shore his conquest shall confine.
The Parian marble there shall seem to move
In breathing statues not unworthy Jove,—
Resembling heroes whose ethereal root
Is Jove himself, and Cæsar is the fruit.
Troe and his race the sculptor shall employ;
And he—the god who built the walls of Troy."

It was with statues of gods and heroes that the Romans adorned the temples and buildings in Britain, and for their production, corporations of statuaries were established in the island, as they were indeed in all the provinces of the empire. But of all the statues with which they were adorned there are few only in existence; and they are of a date when the sculptor's art was on the decline; for with the decline of the Roman power every department of art became deteriorated.

As regards painting, there is no doubt that the ancient Britons had a certain knowledge of that imitative art. It was practised on their bodies. Both Cæsar and Pliny speak of their body painting, asserting that it consisted of one uniform colour—blue from the glastum, or *woad*—from head to foot. Other writers, however, assert that it was performed in a more artificial manner. Herodian says that they drew figures of animals of all kinds on their naked bodies, which they esteemed a great ornament; and other authors speak of it as a distinct profession among the ancient Britons. The painting of the body appears, indeed, to have been the medium of distinguishing the rank of those painted. Those of inferior rank had but a few small figures of coarse workmanship; while those of superior rank had figures in greater numbers and larger dimensions. The artist's mode of painting was truly original, and its operation must have been so painful that it is a marvel how those operated upon could have borne it. The skin was punctured with the intended figures by a sharp instrument, that it might imbibe and retain the colouring matter; and he who bore it with the greatest fortitude, and received the deepest punctures, says Solinus, was esteemed the bravest of the brave. The early Britons, therefore, carried the badges of their nobility on their skins; but when clothing came into use, they were painted on their shields. The same figures were employed, but they were now painted, in imitation of life, in various colours. It is evident, therefore, that the Britons had a genius and a certain taste for the art of painting, and as the Romans excelled in it, under these masters it was brought to great perfection in all its branches in Britain. There are even specimens of the decorative paintings in this period still in existence. In a Roman villa at Bignor, in Sussex, there are mosaic pavements, and painted walls of bold and elegant designs, whose colours are still fresh, and whose chemical composition are said to be similar to those employed in the baths of Titus at Rome and the buildings discovered in the ruins of Pompeii. It is probable that not only British architects were employed by Constantius in the erection of Autun, but British sculptors and painters.

Of the poetry of the ancient Britons, no satisfactory account can be given. All, indeed, that is really known is, that there were two classes of poets among the Druids—the Vates, who composed hymns to the gods, and the Bards, who celebrated the battles of heroes, and sang of love. It is supposed that their mode of versification resembled that of the remains of Ossian, which are generally considered to be of Gothic or monkish origin; but no extracts can be given from those remains as a genuine example. That the ancient poets of Britain, however, were popular and held in high esteem by the Britons, is evident. They were exempted from taxes and military services; they were seated near the persons of the king or chieftain at all public festivals and assemblies; and they not only received valuable presents, but had lands allotted them for their support. In this noble art the Britons were not favoured by the Romans; for, as before shown, the literature cultivated by them was not native, but exotic: that is, it was derived from Greece. But apart from the non-cultivation of the art of poetry among the Romans as a people, there were other reasons for its decay among the Britons. When they yielded up their arms they lost their free and martial spirit. No longer could they have any pleasure in the songs of their bards, which celebrated the achievements of their brave ancestors! Those bards, indeed, persecuted by their conquerors, who feared the effects of their martial lays, and neglected by their countrymen, either abandoned their country or their profession, and the taste for poetry died away: only, however, as will be seen in a future page, to be revived again in the posterity of those whose harps had been thus hung on the willows.

The harp was the chief musical instrument of the ancient Britons. "The bards," says Ammianus Marcellinus, "celebrate the brave actions of illustrious men in heroic poems, which they sing to the sweet sounds of the lyre." It may be that they possessed wind instruments, but it is clear that they chiefly delighted in the lyre or harp. Every poet was a musician, and sung his own verses to the sound of some musical instrument, the harp being the most popular. Of what number of strings the ancient British harp consisted, is unknown; but it was

CELTIC HARP.

clearly an instrument superior to that which is said to have been first invented by the Scythians, and used by all Celtic nations; namely, one consisting of only four or five strings, or thongs made of the skin of an ox, and played upon with a plectrum made of the jaw-bone of a goat. The ancient Britons played upon it with their fingers, and not with a plectrum, and therefore it must have been of superior manufacture to the rude harp of the Scythians. The arts of poetry and music among the ancient Britons may be said to have been twin sisters, for they were inseparable. The bards composed their tunes as well as their poems, and their music was in general simple and natural, and adapted to the burden of their songs. Thus, if they sang of war, their music was calculated to arouse the passions of rage and revenge; if of love, their strains were soft and tender. Of the music of the Roman period less is known than that of the ancient Britons. It formed no part of the Roman policy to encourage the cultivation of either poetry or music in the provinces. In Rome there was music and dancing in their *conviviums*, which were frequently prolonged during many hours of the night: and how madly the Romans feasted after a victory may be seen in one of the epodes of Horace, which he addressed to Mæcenas after Augustus had triumphed over some of his enemies:—

"When shall we quaff, my friend, the flowing wine,
Redeemed from pious feasts and joys divine?
Cæsar with conquest comes! and gracious Jove
Who gave that conquest shall our joys approve:
Then bid the breath of harmony inspire
The Doric flute, and wake the Phrygian lyre:
As late when the Neptunian youth who spurn'd
A mortal birth, beheld his navy burned,
And fled affrighted through his father's waves,
With his perfidious host; his host of slaves
Freed from those chains with which his rage designed,
Impious! the free-born sons of Rome to bind.
* * * * * *
Boy, bring us larger bowls, and fill them round
With Chian, or the Lesbian vintage crown'd,
Or rich Cæcubian, which may best restrain
Those sickening qualms, and fortify the brain."

But while the conquerors feasted and made merry, their conquered subjects were not indulged with music and song, and hence those fair twin sisters, Music and Poetry, which had before the Roman conquest flourished in our island, languished together.

CHAPTER V.

The History of Industry, Commerce, etc., from B.C. 55 to A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

ROMAN historians have represented the ancient Britons as a ferocious people; and their dictum has been followed by some of the most eloquent historians of modern times. A brief view of their commerce will prove that this is to a considerable extent an erroneous view of their social condition. When Cæsar invaded Britain, commerce was certainly far more extensive and important than could have existed if the Britons had been mere savages. It was not that species of commerce of which we read, when on the first discovery of savage nations articles of real value have been exchanged for those of little or no worth, as in the Pelew Islands, for instance, where its first visitors could obtain a pair of good fat ducks for an old brass button. The ancient Britons were wiser than this. Their commerce was a barter for commodities of value on both sides, and of which every country engaged in it stood in need. They appear, in truth, to

have understood somewhat of the sentiments concerning commerce, which has been thus aptly expressed by the poet Cowper:—

—"The band of commerce was designed
To associate all the branches of mankind;
And if a boundless plenty be the robe,
Trade is the golden girdle of the globe.
Wise to promote whatever end he means,
God opens fruitful Nature's various scenes:
Each climate needs what other climes produce,
And offers something to the general use;
No land but listens to the common call,
And in return receives supplies from all.
This genial intercourse and mutual aid
Cheers what were else a universal shade,
Calls Nature from her ivy-mantled den,
And softens human rock-work into men.
'Tis thus reciprocating, each with each,
Alternately the nations learn and teach;
While Providence enjoins to every soul
A union with the vast terraqueous whole.
Heaven speed the canvass, gallantly unfurled
To furnish and accommodate a world,
To give the pole the produce of the sun,
And knit the unsocial climates into one."

The commerce of ancient Britain was twofold—internal and foreign; that is, tribe traded with tribe, and some of these tribes at least traded with other nations. The internal commerce was carried on by way of barter and exchange: thus Solinus says of the Silures, "they make no use of money in commerce, but exchange one thing for another." To what extent this internal trade was anciently carried on there are no means of judging, as no written records or literary remains have reached our times. From the same cause it would be difficult to discover when Britain commenced a system of trade with other nations. That it was, however, at a very early date, we have the direct testimony of Strabo and other ancient writers. Commerce with Britain was carried on by Phœnician merchants, who traded for the tin, which was so abundant on the coast of Cornwall that it gave the name of Cassiterides to a cluster of islands now called Scilly, from whence the tin was dug and exported. It is not, indeed, improbable that the British Islands were visited by the navigators of the parent Asiatic states—Sidon and Tyre. It was with the alloy of tin that the civilized nations of antiquity hardened copper, and made it serve for warlike instruments and various other purposes. Tin is mentioned in the book of Numbers under the term *oferet;* and it is supposed also to be mentioned by the Prophet Ezekiel under the name of *bedil*, as one of the commodities in which Tyre traded with Tarshish. As tin could only be obtained from Britain and Spain, this would indicate that a commerce with either the one or the other, or both of those countries, was carried on 1,500 years before the Christian era. It is from the circumstance that Spain produced tin as well as Britain, that no precise date can be fixed when it was first exported from our island. As regards the Phœnicians, Bochart and others fix the date of their discovery of the Cassiterides at B.C. 904, while others imagine that it was made by Himilco, who was sent with a fleet from Carthage to explore the sea and coasts northward of the Straits of Gibraltar, about B.C. 600. But whenever it was discovered, it is certain that the Greeks, through the Phœnicians, received all their tin from the islands called Cassiterides, or "the tin islands." Such is the express testimony of Herodotus, who adds that he did not know in what part of the world these islands were situated. The confessed ignorance of Herodotus as to the situation of the Cassiterides strikingly confirms an ancient statement that the Phœnicians, in order to monopolize the trade, kept the knowledge of these islands from all other nations. On one occasion, it is stated, when a Roman ship was employed to watch a Phœnician vessel, the master of the latter ran his ship on shore, where she was lost, together with the Roman vessel, for which act of heroism he was indemnified from the public treasury. This is an evidence that the trade was a valuable one. Indeed the Phœnicians conveyed cargoes of tin into all the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, and even into India, where it was highly valued. Nor was tin the only article for which the enterprising Phœnicians undertook their voyages to Britain; they came to our island for lead likewise. This would indicate that they were better acquainted with Britain, and had penetrated farther into it than is commonly imagined. For tin they had only occasion to come to the Scilly Islands—or to the neighbouring peninsula of Cornwall, which was probably considered one of them—but for lead they would have had to trade with the Coritani, in the present Derbyshire; or the Dimetæ, in Cardiganshire; the Ordovices in Denbighshire; and

TIN MINE, CORNISH COAST.

greatly increased. Among the articles imported the following are mentioned by Roman writers: wines, spices, articles for the table of every kind known at that period, tools, arms, furniture, and clothing. There can be no doubt also that books were imported, for we are expressly informed that the Britons indulged in the luxury of reading Roman authors. That books were an article of commerce there can be no question, for Rome had its Paternoster Row; its bibliopolæ, living mostly in one street called Argiletus. There appears, also, to have been booksellers in other quarters, and notwithstanding the art of printing was unknown, books were very numerous at Rome. That the imports into Britain during the Roman domination were varied and extensive, is proved by the fact that for some time they exceeded the exports in value, and that the balance of trade was considerably against the Britons; involving them, indeed, in a grievous load of debt. When, however, the Romans had completed the conquest, and the Britons improved in the knowledge of agriculture and the arts, they provided themselves by their industry with many things they had previously imported, and raised and prepared many new articles for exportation, by which means the balance of trade became in their favour. By their industry and skill they became not only enabled to pay their debts, but to enrich themselves with the Roman coin. For at this period the Britons no longer exchanged one commodity for another; or for brass money, or rings, or plates of iron of a determinate weight, as Cæsar relates they did when he invaded the island; but they sold their commodities for coins made of the precious metals having the image of the Roman Emperors stamped upon them.

RING MONEY.

SECTION III.

CONNECTED with the subject of commerce, is that of coinage, roads, and shipping, each of which requires brief notice.

If the Britons were ignorant of the use of money and the art of coinage when Cæsar was in Britain, they did not long remain so. Ancient British coins extant testify to the fact that the art was known before Claudius visited the island. The most remarkable and the most perfect of those in existence were struck in the reign of Cunobeline, who lived between the first and second Roman invasions. These coins are of different metals—gold, silver, and brass, or bronze—are circular in form, and display considerable taste in their execution, all of them being of different dies or stamps. Tacitus speaks of Prasutagus, king of the Iceni at the time of the invasion by Claudius, as a prince of great wealth; and Caractacus, in his noble speech to that emperor, alludes to his wealth, in which it is presumed money was included. Londinium is also described by Tacitus as a city inhabited by wealthy merchants twenty years after the second invasion, so that it appears probable that a current coin existed anterior to that event. The Roman Conquest, however, not only entirely changed the coinage of the Britons, but in a short time increased the quantity. It was no longer that of British princes used in trade and commerce, but Roman money stamped with the image and titles of the Roman emperors. It was, indeed, enacted by an imperial edict, and enforced by severe penalties, that no person should use any money in Britain but such as was stamped with the effigies of Cæsar. This edict had its full effect, for it is related that all British money was either concealed or melted down, and that of Roman coinage only, as in all the other provinces, passed current. "Whose image and superscription is this?" is a question that might have been asked in Britain as well as in Judea. They were stamped on coins of gold, silver, and copper; and the original abundance of Roman money in this island is testified by the quantities of Roman coins bearing the image and superscription of all the Roman emperors during their domination, which have been found from time to time in almost every part of the country. Coins even of those emperors who ruled at Rome when historians are silent about Britain are among the number discovered, as those of Gordianus Pius, who assumed the purple in A.D. 239. Towns and villages, mines and open fields, have for ages yielded up these undoubted proofs of the wealth and prosperity enjoyed by the Britons under the rule of the Romans.

It has been supposed by some writers that before the Roman dominion there were no roads in Britain. Camden, the learned antiquarian, expresses his disbelief of their existence. Tradition says there were roads: that King Dunwallo began the four highways of Britain, and that they were perfected by his son Belinus, "who caused workmen to be called, and set them to pave with stone the said ways, that they might be sufficiently known to all waygoers or travellers." But we do not ground our faith in the existence of roads on tradition, but on sounder proofs. It is distinctly stated that there were covered pathways leading from one town to another, which, by a singular perversity of reasoning, Southey adduces as proofs of the ferocity of the Britons. These pathways rather indicate an approach to civilization, for they appear to have been used chiefly for great gatherings, for civil or religious celebrations. But for trade there must have been other roads than these covered pathways—roads leading from one place to another in the mutual intercourse with the tribes, and roads leading from the interior to the coasts, for the conveyance of skins to the merchants of Phœnicia. That the Britons were acquainted with the method of land carriage long before they were invaded by the Romans

is certain, for they had wheel carriages for the conveyance of their goods from place to place. Then, again, according to Cæsar they had great numbers of war-chariots, which implied the existence of roads; otherwise, of what avail would they have been in the marshy coast-lands, or in the woody interior? The celerity of Cæsar's own movements, and the four thousand chariots which Cassivellaunus opposed to his progress, render it impossible that they could have marched to meet each other in mortal combat without roads. These roads may have been imperfect, but it is certain that they had some kind of roads for mutual communication. It would appear, indeed, that the roads of the ancient Britons in general ran along the chain of hills, and threw out lateral branches leading to adjacent towns and villages. Following the windings of the hills, and occasionally descending to the plains, they sometimes passed through woods, and sometimes contiguous to corn-fields, from whence the produce was conveyed by their wheel-carriages to what are called towns. A road acknowledged to have been made by the ancient Britons still crosses Salisbury Plain, and covered ways or lines of communication belonging to the same period are discerned in other parts of Wiltshire. It was not, however, till the Romans came into Britain as conquerors that the art of road-making was brought to perfection. The Romans were great road-makers. This was one



LONDON STONE.

of the chief means employed in their conquests. Thus Herodian says of Severus when he marched against the northern tribes, that "he endeavoured to render the marshy places stable by means of causeways, that his soldiery treading with safety might easily pass them, and having firm footing, fight to advantage." But the roads were not constructed in the Roman provinces for the sole purpose of marching the legions through them: by them cities and towns were united as they now are by highways and railway communications. By these roads—which were characterized by bold cuttings and solid terraces, carried by piles over marshy ground, and raised upon piers where elevation was required—land carriage was made as easy and convenient as at the present day, and the island was made one whole. The roads constructed by the Romans, indeed—of which examples are in existence—stretched from the shores of the English Channel to those of the Irish Sea and the German Ocean, and connected all the inland country from the Thames to the Tyne.

In the earliest period of their history, the ancient Britons possessed no vessels which could lay claim to the name of a ship. It does not appear that it was in vessels of British bottom that the commerce even with the Gauls was carried on. The trade appears chiefly if not wholly conducted by continental vessels; for there is no evidence of any extended interchange of visits between the Britons and continental nations. At the same time there is reason to believe that before Cæsar invaded our island, some of the tribes living on the coasts opposite Gaul built small vessels for exporting their commodities to the Continent. They must have been bold mariners, indeed, if in the frail barks they are said only to have possessed, they had ventured across the Channel with merchandize.

ANCIENT BRITISH CANOE.

BRITISH CORACLE.

Solinus gives a similar idea of the boats in which the ancient natives of Ireland and Caledonia crossed the sea which divides those two countries. "That sea," he says, "is so unquiet and stormy that it is only navigable in summer, when the people of these countries pass and repass it in small boats made of wattles, and covered with the hides of oxen." It is certain that the smaller canoes of the ancient Britons, which they carried on their backs from river to river in their fishing and hunting excursions, were of wicker-work. Cæsar himself says that he transported his army over a river in Spain in boats resembling those he had seen in Britain, but he would not have ventured to have crossed the Channel in such frail barks. Although, therefore, the ancient Britons navigated their rivers in their "reedy boats," and may even have had the bold daring to venture over the narrow seas to Gaul and Ireland in them, it can scarcely be believed that they had no vessels of a larger size, better construction, and more solid materials. Those on the coasts opposite Gaul, who had come from thence with their wives and children in order to settle in Britain, must have possessed ships of greater capacity and strength when they came; and for their own security, and for the preservation of their communication with their kindred on the Continent, it is natural to suppose that they would keep up their fleets. Cæsar, indeed, expressly states that the Gauls received auxiliaries constantly from Britain in their wars with the Romans, and it is certain that no considerable force could have crossed the Channel in vessels of wicker-work. That sea was dangerous to his own fleet: how much more dangerous, therefore, would it have been to vessels which bore no comparison to those in which his legions were wrecked? In describing the ships of the Veneti, Cæsar says that they were very large, lofty, and strong, built entirely of thick planks of oak, and so solid that the beaks of the Roman ships could make no impression upon them. Now the Veneti and the Britons were allies, and in a great sea-fight off the coast of Armorica their combined fleets contended with that of Cæsar, so that it is clear that the Britons had ships of the same form and construction as those of the Veneti. It is even probable that the oak of which both fleets was built was British oak, for no country produced it in greater abundance or perfection. The old tale, therefore, that the ancient Britons only possessed vessels of wicker-work must at least be received with great caution. In the sea-fight between Cæsar and the Veneti and Britons, his usual success attended him; their naval power was broken, and it is probably from this cause that when in the succeeding year he invaded Britain, no attempt was made to oppose him by sea.

But while the Britons must have had ships which enabled them to cross the Channel in safety, they had none of a form, capacity, or strength to enable them to undertake long voyages. Even if they had they had not sufficient skill in navigation to conduct them to distant countries. That art required length of years and much experience before it could have been brought to perfection. Strabo says that the Britons of the south never sailed further southward than to the mouth of the river Garonne in Gaul; while the Poems of Ossian intimate that those of the north never ventured further northward than the north of Norway, or south than the south of Denmark. It is probable that these *were* the utmost points to which the ancient Britons sailed, for as they had no compass to guide their course, and their voyages were performed under the simple guidance of the stars, it is not likely that they would venture to sail to distant and unknown regions.

Under the Romans this ignorance of the Britons in the arts of ship-building and navigation passed away. They had for centuries turned their attention to maritime affairs. In their wars with the Carthaginians they saw the necessity of having a fleet to contend with them by sea; and from that time they became as formidable by sea as by land. In the first Punic war it was chiefly carried on in quinquiremes; that is, vessels with four, five, and more ranks of rowers. Subsequently they built triremes, ships with three ranks of rowers, which were divided into two classes, one consisting of real men of war, and the other of transports for soldiers, sailors, or horses. It was with such ships as these that Cæsar sailed to Britain. The Romans excelled in the arts of ship-building and navigation. No other nation, indeed, could be compared to them in the knowledge of these arts. Their model had been taken from their rivals the Carthaginians, for it is recorded that one of their quinquiremes having ran ashore on the Bruttian coast, it was taken and sent to Rome and made the shipwright's model. With one hundred vessels built after this pattern the Romans gained their first naval victory, and from that time Rome became a great naval power. So jealous did they become of the art of ship-building—knowing that it was a grand instrument in their career of conquest—that it was made penal for any Romans to teach it to nations with whom they were at war. When, however, a nation or people was brought under their dominion, that noble art was readily imparted to them. Claudius even conferred several privileges on those Britons who built ships for trade: privileges which were confirmed and augmented by succeeding emperors. Numerous merchant ships were erected in Britain for the purposes of trade throughout the Roman period. Londinium abounded in shipping: and as we have seen at one time—A.D. 359—eight hundred ships were employed in the exportation of corn only: each of which was probably capable of carrying ten thousand Roman modia, or about three hundred and twelve English quarters of grain: that being the size stipulated for all built by those on whom the Roman emperors conferred privileges. Of the whole number employed in trade in any one period of Roman Britain no mention is made, but if eight hundred were employed in the export of corn only, they must, in the year A.D. 359, have been very numerous. It seems to be nowhere recorded, but it may be presumed, that, as Britain abounded with oak, the natives were also employed in the construction of ships of war, for a considerable fleet was throughout the Roman domination kept up for the preservation of the trade of Britain. The dominion of the seas was a part of the policy of the Roman empire, for without it its conquests beyond the Continent could neither have been made nor maintained. Hence it was that a fleet of ships of war was stationed in the harbours and on

the coasts of Britain from the earliest period of its conquest. In later times when the Franks and Saxons carried on their piratical excursions on the British seas, that fleet was considerably increased, and so powerful was it that it enabled the faithless Carausius, to whom its command had been given, to assume the imperial purple, and to become the unrivalled sovereign of the seas. So dreaded was his power and that of his successor Alectus by sea, that the Emperor Constantius did not dare to attempt the recovery of Britain before he had collected a fleet of one thousand sail, and even then he stole as it were into Britain in a fog, as though he was anxious to avoid coming into collision with the British fleet. His recovery of Britain by the defeat and death of Alectus appears to have been considered by the Romans a second conquest, both of the British seas and of our famous island, for Eumenius, in a florid panegyric on the exploit of Constantius, writes: "Britain is restored; the Franks exterminated; and many nations which are conspired together are constrained to make submission. Rejoice, O invincible Cæsar, for thou hast conquered another world; and by restoring the glory of the naval power of Rome, hast added to her empire a greater element than the whole earth." Subsequently when the Saxon sea-rovers re-appeared in the British seas, the Romans not only kept a fleet constantly cruising in search of them, but erected forts for the defence of the coasts of Britain; both the fleet and the forts being placed under an officer entitled the "Count of the Saxon Shores." It was by these means that British commerce was protected as long as the Roman power continued in its vigour; but when that power was broken—when the Roman fleets and garrisons were withdrawn—then it not only languished but was almost annihilated; for the dominion of the seas fell into the hands of the Frank and Saxon pirates, and British ships were not even secure in their own harbours.

CHAPTER VI.

History of Manners, Customs, etc., from B.C. 55 to A.D. 449.

SECTION I.

CONCERNING the manners and customs of the ancient Britons very little is known. Some authors charge them with immoral habits unknown even to the worst tribes in other parts of the world. There can be no doubt but they had their vices, but then they also had their virtues. Their ruling passions appear to have been pride, anger, ferocity, credulity, rashness, and inconstancy. These may be considered their natural failings: failings in which all the nations of the world participate. Legible traces of them may be discovered in our own Christian community, boast as we may of our high state of civilization. What wonder is it, therefore, that they were the characteristics of the ancient inhabitants of our island? The positive vices ascribed to them was their love of war and plunder, sloth, and drunkenness. But what nation delighted in war and plunder more than the Romans who have charged the Britons with these vices? While they made war only among themselves, and plundered only one another, the Romans warred with and plundered the whole world. What was criminal among the Britons, therefore, must have been more highly criminal among the Romans. As regards the sloth with which they stand charged, that may have arisen from their passion for war; for educated in the midst of arms and accustomed from infancy to hear nothing admired or celebrated but deeds of valour, they looked upon all other professions as dishonourable. It is singular, also, that while Roman writers speak of the love which the Britons had for war as one of their vices, that among their virtues *valour* in war stands forth prominently in their pages. The charge of drunkenness recorded against them appears to be without the slightest foundation. On the contrary, they were *not* addicted to habits of intemperance. It may be, as the Latin writers assert, that they did use a preparation from barley which was common to the Gauls and all the nations of the west and north, and which preparation was intoxicating; but it is certain that their principal beverage was water, and that even at their feasts they toasted each other in mead or metheglin. Diodorus Siculus bears testimony to their frugality; and Tacitus refers to that virtue among them when he records that, after the Conquest, they learned to "imitate the Roman vices and luxuries." It is clear, therefore, that the ancient Britons were not the depraved people some writers would have us believe. Even the Roman writers give them credit for some notable virtues, besides valour in battle and frugality; as hospitality, chastity, conjugal fidelity, sincerity, and social affections. Of these virtues it will be sufficient to notice their hospitality as an exemplification of the ancient British character.

Hospitality was a characteristic of all Celtic nations, but more especially of the ancient Britons. No stranger was ever turned from their doors. Diodorus Siculus says that it was considered infamous by them for a chieftain even to close the door of his house at all; lest, as their bards expressed it, "Strangers should come and behold his contracted soul." Their treatment of strangers resembled that which existed among the Oriental nations of antiquity, and which still exists in some of the countries of the East. Water was presented to them to wash their feet; they had the best their host could produce laid before them; they were entertained with the music of the harp; and while they remained, their persons were esteemed sacred and

inviolable. Nothing was omitted to prove that they were welcome, and to induce them to prolong their stay; and when they departed it was usual for the host and the guest to exchange some piece of armour, which was preserved with religious care as tokens of mutual friendship, and the rights of hospitality established between them and their families and posterity. Hospitality, in a word, appears to have been considered a sacred duty among the ancient Britons; and a people so large-minded could scarcely have been so ferocious as Roman writers would have us believe.

Of the customs of the ancient Britons as little is known as of their vices and virtues. There are two particular customs, however, of which brief accounts are given by Roman writers; namely, the rites of marriage and of sepulture.

In the first stages of society the ceremonies of marriage were few and simple. Little more was necessary, indeed, in those primitive times than a mutual affection and a few presents expressive of that affection, delivered to each other in the presence of their friends at the marriage feast: for no marriage was solemnized without a feast to which all relations of both parties within the third degree were invited. Among the Germans—and it was no doubt the custom also among the Britons—Tacitus says that the wife brought no dowry to the husband, but the husband to the wife. At the same time he says, among the ancient Britons the father of the bride made a present of his own arms to his son-in-law. The presents given to the bride were not those of ornament, but oxen, horses, and arms, which Tacitus observes were given to intimate to her that she was to partake of her husband's toils and dangers as well as his pleasures. Sometimes, if the parties were rich, presents were made to their friends; but if they were poor, then each of their friends made them a present according to their ability.

Grief for the dead is a display of the best feelings of the human heart. This feeling is exhibited among the ancient Britons in strong colours by the numerous barrows they erected for their interment. Their funeral rites appear to have varied in different parts of Britain; or, at all events, in different ages. Their earliest mode seems to have been to place the body in a cist or coffer with the legs bent upwards to the head, but at a later date they laid it in the grave at full length. In some instances the bodies were enclosed in a strong wooden box riveted with bronze; while in others they were consumed by fire and the ashes carefully deposited on the floor in the barrow. If the British nations in the south had the same funeral rites as those of their kindred in Gaul, which seems probable, the favourite animals of the deceased were thrown into the funeral pile on which the body was burnt, and in some instances some even of his human favourites—servants and friends. It is evident that the bodies of the tribes living in the south were burnt, as numerous urns of British workmanship have been discovered in several places full of ashes and human bones half burnt. It was customary, also, to burn the arms of the deceased, the remains of which were carefully collected and preserved in the same manner as the ashes and bones, and deposited in the same barrow—that is, under large circular heaps of earth and stones. When, however, the dead were buried at full length—if the deceased was a warrior—his sword, his daggers, and his arrows, were laid by his side. All these rites of sepulture, though repugnant to the feelings of a Christian, indicate that the ancient Britons cared for and had affection for departed friends.



ANCIENT BRITISH CIST.

Fairholt, in his 'Costume of England,' thus describes a curious tumulus opened in A.D. 1834 on the cliffs of Gristhorpe, near Scarborough. "In it was found the body of a man enclosed in a coffin roughly formed from the trunk of an oak. Owing to the nature of the soil the contents had been well preserved, and the bones become of an ebon colour. The skull was most striking, from the unusual prominence of the superciliary arches, and the depression immediately above them; the hollow between them was very deep, the nose prominent, and the whole aspect singularly wild and savage. The remains of a bronze dagger was found with flint heads of arrows and a javelin. Pins of bone and wood were found on the body, which had been used to secure the mantle of skin in which it was enveloped. Fragments of a bone ring and of a girdle ornament were also found, as well as a small basket of wickerwork, the bottom and sides formed of bark, stitched together by the sinews of animals. From the rude simplicity of this funeral deposit, we may safely conjecture that we look on an ancient Silurian chief, who, in accordance with a Roman record, devoted his days to the chase, at a time when the Phœnician traders only came to the southern counties of England."

The ordinary dress of a Briton at this early period—when at least any garment was worn—was the skin of a spotted cow, of the beasts killed in hunting, or a cloak of sheepskin. It has, however, been seen that after the connection of the ancient Britons with the Phœnician traders, those living on the coasts learned the arts of dressing wool and flax, and spinning coarse cloth. Before the Roman Invasion, therefore, some of them—and especially the chiefs and Druids—wore articles of clothing. Accordingly we find that the dress of a British chieftain consisted of the following articles: a close coat which was shaped like a tunic open before and having long close sleeves reaching to the wrist; loose pantaloons called by the Romans *brages* and *braccæ*, whence the term "breeches;" a mantle or cloak called by the Romans *Sagum*, which was thrown over the shoulders; a conical cap, and shoes made of raw cowhide, with the hair turned outward, and reaching as far as the ankles. The Druidical costume was of patriarchal simplicity

consisting of a long white garment which covered their persons, and reached to the ground; a mantle of white, probably bordered with purple, which hung from their shoulders and fell in broad folds to the feet, and a crown of oak leaves. The Arch-Druid was chiefly distinguished from the rest of his order by holding in his hand a sceptre: a symbol of the power he exercised over the minds of the people. Of the female dress of this early period there are no relics except some ornaments: such as necklaces and ornaments. Dion Cassius, however, states that Boadicea wore a golden torque round her neck; had her arms and wrists ornamented with bracelets; and wore a tunic of several colours which hung in folds about her, over which was thrown a cloak which was fastened by a fibula or brooch. The difference of the dress of the sexes, indeed, appears chiefly to have consisted in that of the females making more use of linen than the men, and that the sleeves of their tunics did not reach to the wrists, but left their arms bare.

ANCIENT ORNAMENTS.

Like the ancient Gauls, the hair of the Britons was allowed to grow thick on the head. Various arts were used by them to make it grow thick and long, its length being not only esteemed a great beauty, but considered to be a mark of dignity and noble birth. Its natural colour was yellow, and they were accustomed to make it brighter by art. Thus Dion Cassius says of Boadicea, "she wore long yellow hair flowing over her shoulders."

Concerning the diet of the ancient Britons, few words will suffice. Anciently, no doubt, they lived chiefly on the spontaneous productions of the earth, and the fruits of the chase, or fishing, with little or no preparations, a circumstance which may have led to the doubtful story that they did not abstain from devouring human flesh. If such was the case, it must have been at a very remote period, and among the ruder tribes only; for although Strabo asserts that it was the custom, and St. Jerome says that when he was in Gaul he saw the Attacoti, a British nation who fed on human flesh—especially delighting in the buttocks of herdsmen and the breasts of women—their authority is more than doubtful. It is quite clear that at the time of the first Roman invasion the British nations in the south had an abundance of provisions, which they prepared in the same manner as their kindred on the Continent, baking their bruised corn as before described, and boiling, broiling, or roasting the flesh of their animals, in which the country abounded. The Britons had also venison, game, and poultry; but from superstitious motives, hares, hens, and geese formed no part of their diet. The tribes northward appear to have been strangers to grain, and to have abstained from eating fish, so that the staple of their diet was the natural productions of the earth—milk, and the flesh of animals, wild and tame. Thus Dio Nicæs says of the Mætæ and the Caledonians at the beginning of the third century: "They inhabit barren mountains or marshy plains, have no cultivated or manured lands, but feed on the milk and flesh of their flocks, on what they get by hunting, and on some wild fruits. They never eat fish, though they have plenty of them. When they are in the woods, they feed on roots and leaves." It is no wonder that a people accustomed to such hard fare should, after they had once burst through the barriers which separated the Roman provinces from their sterile country, and had tasted of the fat of the land, return year after year to plunder and destroy.

It would appear that the chief diversions of the ancient Britons consisted in feasting, dancing to the music of the harp, and hunting. Their rural sports were swimming, leaping, climbing, running, wrestling, throwing the stone, darting the lance, horsemanship, and driving the chariot. All these sports were practised by them in order to fit them for the field, and for the chase. Such exercises as these were until recently held in high repute in the Highlands and islands of Scotland, where old customs maintained their ground long after they had been abolished in Southern Britain. Every chieftain kept a band of active young men, who in times of peace were constantly employed in manly exercises. Throwing the stone was one of those exercises: one being placed at the gate of every chieftain's house, at which strangers were invited to try their strength and skill. That the youth of ancient Britain was thus trained for the dread art of war, and that they profited by that training is evident from history. Thus Boadicea is represented as reminding her army that they were so swift of foot that the Romans could not overtake them; and that they could swim over rivers which the Romans could hardly pass in boats. Cicero also bears testimony to their wonderful skill in horsemanship and chariot-driving. Writing to his friend Trebatius, who served under Cæsar, that he heard Britain neither yielded gold nor silver, he exhorted him to capture one of the essedæ—a kind of flying chariot—and make his way back to Rome with all speed; and in another letter he cautioned him to take care that he was not snatched up by some driver of one of these vehicles before he was aware. The horses, for which Britain at that early period was already famous, were a small hardy breed, so well trained as to accommodate themselves to the woods and the most difficult ground. They could be stopped or turned by the charioteer in a moment, even when at full speed. The essedæ was the most formidable war-chariot, and the most dreaded by the Romans, not excepting the covinus, which was armed with a scythe. That was simply used to break the ranks of an enemy, while the essedæ was used in close fighting and pursuit. Homer's heroes are represented as fighting in the same manner as the charioteers of the essedæ.

Thus the great Hector when dyke and wall opposed the passage of his chariots,—

> —— "Full armed betook him to the ground,
> And then all left their chariots when he was seen to lead,
> Rushing about him, and gave up each chariot and steed
> To their directors."

In like manner the essedæ, besides the charioteer, contained two or three warriors, who threw the javelin at the foe, or descended to engage on foot as occasion offered, a mode of warfare dreaded by the Romans, till taught, by experience of its perils, the best method of encountering them. It was no wonder, then, that Cicero tendered such advice to his friend Trebatius.

SECTION II.

THE transformation of Britain, or the greater part of it, into a Roman province, transformed, as a necessary consequence, the tastes, manners, and modes of life of its inhabitants. Originally, as before recorded, the population of Britain was scattered and divided; but when the Romans had completed its conquest, they were encouraged to form large associations, and invited to a more convenient form of town life than that to which they had been accustomed. Unlike other ancient nations, the Romans did not seek to exterminate conquered peoples, but to found cities out of their population. Even when they conquered towns they did not destroy them. At the same time in such cases they did not leave their former inhabitants in them, but either occupied them with their legions, or by inhabitants sent from Rome. In Britain they had no towns, properly so called, to conquer: there they had to found them. Richard of Cirencester mentions ninety-two cities in Britain, all of which appear to have been governed by municipal regulations according to the laws of Rome, and municipal officers, which were either freely chosen or were forced upon the community. Of the amount of the population of the towns of Roman Britain, there is no precise information; but those of Londinium and Verulamium may be illustrated by the fact that when the revolted Britons attacked them, seventy thousand of their inhabitants were slain. The relics of Roman London and other places also prove that the population was very considerable. As far as can be judged from its remains, Londinium extended from Blackfriars to the Tower on the bank of the river, and in an irregular form to a line formed northward by Bishopsgate. It is within those limits that evidences of the arts and the pagan religion of Rome present themselves. Deep under ground where the Royal Exchange now stands, a pit was discovered in which there were every species of rubbish that could have been collected by a Roman dustman; and at Paul's Cross, where the reformed clergy in the Middle Ages eloquently denounced papal Rome, evidences of a pagan Rome have been disinterred. In a word, within certain limits of the present city tokens of the Roman presence are continually revealed to sight—all telling of a large and busy population here once residing.

It follows, therefore, that this transformation of Britain into a Roman province, and this formation of large cities in which a busy population of various occupations and ranks resided—that as a necessary consequence the manners and customs of the native Britons became transformed likewise. This is in a great degree illustrated in the previous pages of this section, but it may receive further illustration by a brief notice of the external appearance of the Romanized Britons.

Tacitus records that as early as during the command of Agricola, the sons of British chieftains affected the Roman dress. This was only the commencement of the change in British costume. During the rule of the Romans, which extended over a period of more than three hundred years, the Britons became Romanized in their dress, adopting that and the manners in general of their conquerors. The characteristic dress of the Roman citizens was the *toga;* and of the Roman matrons the *stola.* "In general," says Mr. Hope, "the *toga* seems not only to have formed, as it were, a short sleeve to the right arm, which was left unconfined, but to have covered the left arm down to the wrist. A sort of loop or bag of folds was made to hang over the sloped drapery in front, and the folds were made ample enough in the back to admit of the garment being occasionally drawn over the head, as it was customary to do during religious ceremonies, and also probably in rainy weather." This capacious mantle differed but little from the sagum of the ancient Britons; and, indeed, the costumes of Rome found so many analogies in the British garb, that the natives had but to discard the braccæ, or breeches, and to adopt the Roman tunic which reached only to the knee, and they became Romanized. To this, indeed, they soon accommodated themselves, and it became considered as a barbarism to retain the more uncivilized dress. The taunt of the haughty Romans, that the Britons were "breeched barbarians," was no longer heard, for the dress of both Roman and Briton assimilated. Like the *toga*, the dress of the Roman matrons, called the *stola*, was worn over a tunic. It came as low as the ankles or feet, and was fastened round the body by a girdle, leaving broad folds above the breast. It seems to have been usually fastened over the shoulder by a clasp, and generally to have had sleeves. The tunic of the Roman matron did not reach much below the knee, and the essential difference between that and the *stola* seems to have been that the latter had a flounce at the bottom reaching to the instep. This dress was universally adopted by British matrons; but on comparison with that worn before the Romans invaded Britain, it will be found that there was no material difference between them. The hair of British matrons was trimmed after the Roman fashion; and as the Roman ladies wore veils, and several kinds of necklaces, it may be presumed that their example was widely copied by those of Britain. That they wore the same kind of shoes seems evident from a pair found in a stone sarcophagus upon opening a Roman burial-place at Southfleet, in Kent, in A.D. 1862. The Romans, both citizens, matrons, and soldiers, wore richly ornamented shoes. A painting at Herculaneum represents a female wearing shoes which cover the entire feet, and are tied just above the ankle. Such is the shape of the shoes found at Southfleet, and they were of superb workmanship, being made of fine purple leather reticulated in the form of hexagons all over, each hexagonal division

being worked with gold in an elaborate manner. In the British Museum there are many curious specimens of Roman sandals; probably of the same kind, if not the very same, that once covered feet which paced the streets of Roman London. A similar change took place in the costume of the British soldier: that is, those who were permitted to enter the ranks as auxiliaries to fight for empire in foreign countries, or at a later period to protect Roman Britain. There appears to have been but a slight difference between his costume and that of a Roman legionary; and his shield was no longer made of wicker-work, but was coated with metal, and in shape bore a strong resemblance to the Roman *scutum*. Their swords and spear-heads were made of bronze, several of which were discovered some years ago in the bed of the river Witham, in Lincolnshire. A bas-relief, found at Ludgate in A.D. 1669, to the memory of a British soldier named Vivius Marcianus, and is supposed to have belonged to the *cohors Britonum*—a body of soldiers raised to defend the island from the attacks of the Picts and Scots, and Saxons—is thus described by Fairholt:—"He is represented with short hair, a short tunic which is fastened round the waist by a girdle and fibula, a long sagum flung over his breast and left arm, his legs are bare, and in his left hand he holds a scroll, and in his right a long rod which retired Roman veterans carried, the point resting on the ground." The only difference between the costume of this retired British veteran and that of a Roman legionary is that the latter, instead of the Sagum, wore a long and capacious mantle.

Like the costume, the sports and recreations of the Britons became Romanized. As the chariot was laid aside as being unserviceable in the Roman mode of fighting, the enthusiasm for horsemanship they had so long cultivated fell into decay. Being no longer permitted to train themselves for war, the warlike exercises in which their youth and manhood had anciently been trained were no longer necessary. Indeed it is probable that they were even prohibited by law, as it was the policy of the Romans to crush the war spirit of nations brought under their domination. What sports and recreations were introduced by the Romans into Britain are not mentioned in history; but it may be presumed that they bore a strong resemblance to the public games at Rome—always excepting those which had reference to war, as the *Ludus Trojæ*, a species of sham-fight by young men on horseback, the *Pugna Equestris, et Pedestris*, a representation of a battle between cavalry and infantry: and the *Numachia* or representation of a sea-fight. It is not likely that such games were allowed in the provinces, but only those which would have a tendency to bind the natives to the Roman sway; such as games celebrated in honour of the gods, or for simple amusement. Many of the private amusements of the Romans were of a childish nature, ill fitting the dignity of the national character. Even the great Augustus condescended to play at the *par impar ludere*, or the well-known game of odd-and-even, which appears to have been one at least which the Romans has handed down to us for the amusement of our children. It would appear, also, that several games of ball now played in England was introduced by the Romans, as that which was called by them the *pila trigonalis* which was played by three persons standing in the form of a triangle who threw the ball at each other for a display of skill in catching. The chief innocent games of the Romans appear to have been played with the pila or ball, and it may safely be concluded that they were introduced by them among the natives of Britain for their amusement. But the grand amusement which the Romans provided for the Britons appears to have been that of the theatre. It is expressly mentioned that splendid theatres were everywhere erected in Roman Britain, and nothing could be better fitted to lower the warlike character of the natives than the amusement which they afforded. In Rome their ludi was divided into two classes—the *ludi cirenses* and the *ludi scenici*, or those which belonged to the circus and those which belonged to the theatre. It was no doubt the *ludi scenici* which was introduced into Britain; as the *ludi cirenses* for the most part had reference to trials of strength, skill, and war. The *ludi scenici* was pantomime, and in the days of the empire, the pantomimic exhibitions were schools of vice and licentiousness, the actresses in some cases shamelessly appearing naked before the public. Juvenal, in his satiric verse, finely shows the evil effects of such sensual representations upon the females of Rome, and if such were introduced into Britain, as there is every reason to believe was the case, they could not fail to affect British females likewise.

Tacitus says of the Britons: "From using our language and dress they proceeded by degrees to imitate our vices and luxuries, our porticos, baths, and sumptuous entertainments." This would indicate that the mass of the population became completely Romanized. How great must have been the change! Anciently, according to Diodorus, "great fires were kindled, on which pots were placed, and near them spits, with which the Britons boiled and roasted large joints of flesh of different kinds;" and when the feast was prepared, according to another author, the "guests sat in a circle upon the ground, with a little hay, grass, or the skin of some animal under them." The Romanized Briton, however, fared far more sumptuously. He took his *jentaculum* or breakfast; his *prandium* or luncheon; and his *cœna* or dinner, or, more properly speaking, his supper, which was the principal meal of the Romans. And if he imitated their sumptuous entertainments it must be concluded that the dinner of a Roman Briton was served up in three courses. First came the *promulsis* or *antecenæ*, which consisted of all kinds of stimulants, as indicated by Horace:—

> "Around him lay whatever could excite,
> With pungent force the jaded appetite;
> Rapes, lettuce, radishes, anchovy brine,
> With skerret, and the lees of Coan wine."

The second course of a Roman dinner consisted of fish, fowl, and flesh of every variety, the flesh of swine being deemed the most savoury, and especially the sucking-pig. These were accompanied with condiments, to two of which Horace thus alludes:—

> "Two sorts of sauce are worthy to be known;
> Simple the first, of sweetest oil alone:
> The other mixed with full and generous wine,
> With the true pickle of Byzantian brine.

Let it with shredded herbs and saffron boil,
And when it cools pour in Venafrian oil."

The third course was the *bellaria*, or dessert, consisting of fruits, as dates, almonds, dried grapes, &c., and of sweetmeats and confections, as cheese-cakes, almonds, and tarts. It was to such meals as these that the Romans, reclining on their couches, partook of, and in which Tacitus leads us to believe the Romanized Britons learned to indulge, the meal being usually followed by a *comissium* or drinking party, during which there was music and dancing, games and amusements, and libations poured out to the gods.

That the customs of the Romans did take deep root in Britain evidences exist at the present day. The very names of our months and weeks are a blending of Roman and Teutonic thought. January presents itself under the influence of the "two-faced Janus;" March is the month of Mars; July is derived from the great Julius; and August from his kinsman Augustus. Traditionary customs and superstitions still surviving among us speak of the connection which once existed between the Romans and the Britons. Thus parochial perambulations, or beating the bounds of the parish, are derived from the Roman *Terminalia*, a festival in honour of the god called Terminus, who presided over boundaries. The Roman *Floralea Ludi*, held in honour of the goddess Flora, or Chloris, and to obtain from her the protection of blossoms, is our May-day festival. So, also, our marriage ceremonies and our funeral images and customs are all Roman. In the former, the ring placed on the finger of the betrothed as a pledge of fidelity; the veil, the wedding gifts, the garlands and flowers, the groomsmen and bridesmaids, are all of Roman origin; and in the latter, the cypress and the yew, the flowers strewn upon graves, and the black garments of mourning, all refer to the Roman period. Trifles light as air testify to the Roman presence in our island. Lucky days are the Roman *dies albi*, the unlucky *dies atrii*. If we are accustomed to say "God bless you," to one who sneezes, so were the Romans; and if to say when our ears tingle that "some one in the distance is talking of us," the Romans held the same belief. The screech owl was ever a bird of ill omen among the Romans, and so it is among the superstitious at the present day. Their poets and historians have perpetuated that superstition in their pages, and the Britons derived it from them and we from the Britons. All this shows the influence which the Romans once possessed in our island, and how readily the conquered people became influenced by their example, whether for good or for evil.

That the condition of Britain under the Roman rule was prosperous and happy there can be no doubt. The picture, indeed, which the orator Eumenius, in a panegyric on Constantine the Great, presents to us of its condition at that period, does not appear to be greatly overdrawn. "Oh! fortunate Britannia, thee hath nature deservedly enriched with the choicest blessings of heaven and earth. Thou neither feelest the excessive cold of winter nor the scorching heat of summer. Thy harvests reward thy labours with so vast an increase as to supply thy tables with bread, and thy cellars with liquor. Thy woods have no savage beasts, and no serpents harbour there to hurt the traveller. Thy herds of cattle and flocks of sheep are innumerable, feeding thee plentifully and clothing thee richly. And as to the comforts of life, thy days are long, and no night passes without some glimpse of light."

ANCIENT BRONZE BOWL.

SAXON PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

and Military History of Britain, from the Arrival of the Saxons, A.D. 449, to the Invasion of the Normans, A.D. 1066.

SECTION I.

e darkness overspreads the history of our
or a century and a half it is surrounded
obscure and the fabulous. Macaulay even
uestion the existence of such personages as
nd Horsa, Vortigern and Rowena, Arthur
red; broadly stating that their adventures
lassed with those of Hercules and Romulus.
percritical, for it is certain that the Saxons
d in by the Britons to defend them from the
the Scots, and therefore the generally
ccount of the events of the period must
oundation in truth, although some of those
y have been embellished by monkish tra-

tons appear to have been the Sakai-Suna, or
ts of the Sacæ, a tribe of Scythians who are
ncient writers to have migrated towards
m the east in the days of Cyrus the Persian.
re numerous tribes of them, all of which
he pure Teutonic and Gothic race. Those
into Britain at successive periods were the
Angles, and the Saxons. The Jutes and
s appear to have been neighbours, dwelling
mbri Chersonesus, or peninsula of Jutland,
arts of Schleswig Holstein. The Saxons
abited the territories south of the Jutes and
hich extended from the Weser and the Delta,
ow known under the names of Westphalia,
Holland, and part of Belgium.
enerally acknowledged that it was the Jutes
into Britain at the call of Vortigern, and
to the Anglo-Saxon historians they were
d by Hengist and Horsa. They were
sons of Whitgils, who was the son of Witta,
the son of Werta, who was the son of Wodin
who for his exploits in war had been magni-
neration and superstition into a god. This
of the Anglo-Saxon is no doubt mythical,
ver the origin of the leaders of the Jutes may
, it is certain that they were ealdormen or
l therefore men of mark. As before stated,
ared off the coast of Kent in three chiules or
, and readily responded to the invitation of
to land and aid the oppressed Britons
heir fierce enemies the Picts and Scots.
ear to have landed in the Isle of Thanet,
of which was given them in part payment
esistance.

At this time the Picts and Scots had extended their ravages as far as Stamford. Hitherto they had carried on their destructive raids with impunity. They now met with their match. The Saxons were a warlike race. Every warrior was armed with a dagger, spear, battle-axe, and sword, all made of well-wrought steel. They had, also, bows and arrows, and their champions wielded a ponderous club, bound and spiked with iron. These were dangerous enemies to contend

SAXON WARRIOR.

with, and a dangerous people to invite into a country torn by factions, and weakened by invasion. In the first instance, however, Hengist and Horsa punctually fulfilled their engagements with Vortigern. They joined the British forces and a bloody battle was

fought near Stamford, and the Picts and Scots were utterly defeated: those who escaped the slaughter retired into their own territories.

From all that can be gathered of the obscure annals of this period, it would appear that the Saxons were well rewarded for their martial services, and that they were so satisfied with the hospitality and kindness shown them that they were in no haste to quit the island. Nor, if the annals are to be relied upon, were the Britons desirous of getting rid of them. On the contrary, it is related that Hengist gave his young and beautiful daughter Rowena in marriage to Vortigern, and that the Saxon leaders were permitted to fortify the Isle of Thanet, and to invite fresh forces over into Britain. The story of the marriage of Vortigern with Rowena may be doubted, but that other Saxon forces—the Angles—came over in succession is a well-authenticated fact. The Jutes had seen the beauty and fertility of the island, and it may well be imagined that they were desirous of not only settling therein themselves, but to have their old neighbours the Angles as co-partners in the spoils of the land. Hence it may readily be conceived that when the Picts and Scots no longer appeared in South Britain, and the Saxons had gained a firm footing in it, the Britons wished to rid themselves of their dangerous allies, and that these allies formed a notion of taking possession of at least a part if not the whole of the island.

It would appear that the first band of Angles that came over into Britain consisted of about five thousand warriors, and that Hengist and Horsa being thus reinforced then openly displayed their intentions of throwing off the mask of friendship and becoming masters of the Britons. The unwarlike character, and the divided state of the people favoured their views. Single-handed, however, they were not strong enough to carry out their designs. Hence it is recorded that they formed a league with the Picts and Scots, and that when this was effected then it was that they commenced a struggle with the Britons for the mastery. To avert the common danger, the Roman and the British factions laid aside their feuds and fought side by side. Several battles were fought which were bloody but indecisive. At this time it is said that Vortigern had been deposed, the Britons refusing to fight under his banner because of his connection with the Saxons. His son, Vortimer, was elected their leader in his stead, and he appears to have been no unskilful general. According to the common story, indeed, the Saxons employed treachery before they could make any advance in the conquest of the island. Having induced the Britons to agree to a termination of their contention, a great feast was held, at which all the chief personages of both parties were present. The company was mixed; each Saxon had a Briton by his side for his boon companion. All went on merrily, till, on a sudden, Hengist commanded his followers to unsheath their swords—a short weapon which each had brought with him in his hose—and every British warrior except Vortigern was slain. The story of this massacre, however, is a source of contention among historians, some treating it as an undoubted fact in history, and some as legend. A similar story is told of the Saxons of the Continent in relation to the Thuringian chiefs, and if this is true, they may have acted the same treacherous part in Britain; but at the same time it may have been invented, as some have supposed, by the Britons to excuse their own defeat, and to throw odium upon the victors. But whether it was by treachery or by open war one thing is certain—that about eight years after the arrival of Hengist and his followers in the island, the first Saxon kingdom—that of Kent—was founded.

Other Angles or Jutes, or both, now appear to have sailed to Britain, and after plundering the Orkney Isles, to have taken possession of Northumberland and all the country to the Frith of Forth without meeting with much resistance. They are said to have been under the command of Octo, the son, and Ebessa the nephew of Hengist. In the meantime, Hengist is represented as still warring for the possession of his newly-founded kingdom of Kent. Aurelius Ambrosius, a descendant of a Roman family, is said to have been his antagonist and to have fought many battles with varying success, till in the year A.D. 465 he was, according to the Saxon chronicle, utterly defeated at Wippidfleet; the name of the place being derived from Wippid, the only Saxon chief who fell in the battle. Twelve British chieftains fell on that day, but it would appear that the Britons still kept the field, and that the war continued eight years longer, for Hengist is recorded to have at that period gained a more decisive battle than that of Wippidfleet, after which he reigned in peace till the day of his death, A.D. 488.

As before recorded, the Jutes and the Angles were the first Teutonic tribes to arrive in Britain. Whether their arrival was really the result of an invitation may be doubted. It would rather appear to have been a series of piratical expeditions in search of a new home, induced by the spirit of adventure characteristic of the period; or by that mighty movement of people from the east, which pushed already-settled tribes further to the west, covered the sea with adventurers, and gave new masters to every province which had once owned the Roman sway. At all events, if the Jutes and Angles were invited to Britain, the Saxons proper, the third tribe of invaders, had no such plea for settling in the island.

It was in the year A.D. 477 that the Saxons arrived. At that time, Ella and his three sons, and a train of martial followers, landed in the ancient territory of the Regni, now Sussex, at or near Withering, in the Isle of Selsey. On their arrival, the Britons made a vigorous resistance. Several battles were fought, but in the end Ella became master of nearly all Sussex, and established the second Saxon kingdom, which was called *Suth Seaxna rice*, "the kingdom of the South Saxons."

Another band of Saxons under Cerdic appeared in Britain, A.D. 495, landing in the west, at a place which the Saxon chronicle says was named after him, Cerdicshore. Cerdic appears to have been more sternly opposed by the Britons than any chief before him. He is said to have been engaged more than twenty years in war with them for the possession of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, which he finally obtained, founding a kingdom called *West Seaxna rice* "the kingdom of the West Saxons."

It was in the war of the Britons with the Saxons under Cerdic that the renowned Arthur is brought by the old chroniclers before the notice of the historian. His great actions, however, have been celebrated in such romantic strains by British bards, and blended with so much fable by Geoffrey of Monmouth, that the truth of them, and even his very existence, has been called into question. His story may be briefly told. He is said to have been the monarch by right of all Britain, and with the aid of fifteen thousand men from Armorica to have made the Saxons his tributaries. In one battle he slew four hundred and seventy with his own good sword. And he not only conquered the Saxons, but subdued Gaul and other countries, and held his court at Paris. In his days, indeed, Britain is represented as having arrived at such a pitch of grandeur, that in abundance of riches, luxury of ornaments, and politeness of inhabitants it surpassed all other kingdoms. But Arthur's grandeur and tranquillity were cut short by treachery: Mordred brought over barbarous people from different countries, and Arthur was slain in battle, after which the Britons retired into Cornwall and Wales. There can be no doubt that, with the exception of the final retirement of the Britons, all this is romance; but it does not follow that Arthur was a myth, for it is clear that some brave chieftain did contest the territory with Cerdic, as it was not till after many years that he was able to found the kingdom above mentioned—a kingdom which was gradually extended to the Thames and the Severn.

The Saxons having established the kingdoms of Kent, Sussex, and Wessex, other bands of adventurers were induced to try their fortunes, and endeavour to obtain settlements in the island. It was to the east coasts that these adventurers came at different times and under different leaders, until at length three of their chieftains founded in the east and midland parts of Britain the three kingdoms of the East Saxons, the East Angles, and Mercians.

The territories which composed the kingdom of *East Seaxna rice* were chiefly dismembered from that of Kent: consisting of the counties of Essex, Middlesex, and part of Hertfordshire. Its first monarch was Ercewine, who appears to have commenced his reign about A.D. 527-9. The kingdom of the East Angles comprehended the counties of Cambridge, Suffolk, and Norfolk, and its first king Offa began to reign A.D. 575. The kingdom of the Mercians consisted of all the midland counties east of the Severn, and south of Yorkshire and Lancashire, and was founded by Creda A.D. 585. History does not record any events connected with the foundations of these kingdoms, but it may be presumed that they likewise were accompanied by war and bloodshed.

The colony of Saxons before mentioned which had settled on the east coast between the walls of Antoninus Pius and Severus appear to have remained for a long time under several chieftains, no one being sufficiently powerful to assume the title of king. At length, however, in A.D. 547, they were joined by a formidable host of Angles under the command of Ida, who landed at Flamborough Head, and who, soon after his arrival, founded the kingdom of Bernicia. Other invaders—Angles—stepped in between the Tyne and the Humber; and under Ella their chief, after a long and bloody conflict, established the kingdom of Deira. About the year A.D. 617, however, the Angles of Bernicia and Deira were united under one sceptre, bearing the collective title of Northumbria.

It was in this manner—as far as can be gleaned from the obscure annals of the period—that the seven Saxon kingdoms called the Heptarchy were formed in the several parts of Britain mentioned, which soon after began to be called England, from the Angles, which were the most numerous and powerful tribe of the Saxons.

Though the Britons were dispossessed of the most valuable part of their country by these invasions, they still remained in possession of the western coast from the Land's End in Cornwall, and the southern coast from the Land's End to the confines of Hampshire. It is, indeed, a remarkable fact, that during this period of invasion by the Saxons the people of Cornwall took no part in repelling the invaders, although in the year A.D. 470 twelve thousand Britons left its shore to fight for Anthemius, who reigned in Italy, against the Visigoths by whom they were either slain or dispersed. It would appear, however, that the country which they inhabited was divided into four states or principalities—Cornwall, South Wales, North Wales, and Cumberland—and that there was no union among their chieftains, which may account for their apathy towards their suffering kindred in the south. They received them when driven from their homes, but no effort was made to redress their wrongs.

That part of Britain which lay north of the wall of Antoninus Pius and of the Friths of Forth and Clyde was still inhabited by the warlike Picts and Scots; but from the time Hengist is said to have formed a league with them they are scarcely mentioned in history for two centuries. It seems probable, however, that they were engaged in wars against each other or against the Saxons settled between the walls, but no account is given of them in the historic page. The old chronicles of the kings of Scotland record that the different clans of the Scots were united and formed into one nation, A.D. 503: the first monarch being Fergus, the son of Erth. Marvellous tales are recorded of the exploits of Fergus and of some of his successors, but the only truth which can be gathered from them is that they were engaged in war with the Picts and the Northumbrian Saxons from time to time down to the year A.D. 603, when Aidan, the monarch of Scotland at that period, is said to have received a total overthrow, Ethelfred, king of the Northumbrian Saxons, being his antagonist. During this period the Picts also were governed by kings, but their history is equally obscure as that of the Scottish monarchs. Brude, king of the Picts, is recorded to have provoked a war with Aidan, king of the Scots, by refusing to deliver up some fugitives who had taken shelter in his territories to escape the hands of justice, and to have been defeated, but little more is known of the actions of the Pictish monarchs, who flourished in the period when the Saxons were reducing South Britain.

SECTION II.

THE history of the seven separate and independent states or kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons, called the Heptarchy, although clearer than that of the Saxon conquest must yet be considered half fabulous. It is, indeed, a most intricate and perplexing period of the history of Britain. It is generally assumed by historians that there was from the earliest periods of the conquest a lord paramount over the separate states: that is, one king among the seven kingdoms, who was a sort of emperor over the rest, and who was called the Bretwelda, from the Saxon *Bryten Wealda*, which signifies "one whose sway is widely extended." Some times these Bretweldas are said to have dominated by right of conquest, and sometimes by inheritance. The first Bretwelda mentioned is Ella, king of Essex, and the second Ceawlin, king of Sussex. Of these little is recorded which can justify the distinction. The latter assumed the title about A.D. 568, but the dignity is said to have been contested by Ethelbert the fourth king of Kent, who claimed it by right of descent from Hengist. This led to hostilities in which Ethelbert sustained two signal defeats and many reverses; but it is supposed that at the death of Ceawlin, A.D. 593, Ethelbert was acknowledged by the six other kings their rightful Bretwelda.

It is extremely doubtful, however, whether any such dignitary as a Bretwelda did exist in the Saxon Heptarchy. As Hume rightly observes:—"So long as the contest was maintained with the natives the several Saxon princes preserved a union of counsels and interests; but after the Britons were shut up in the barren counties of Cornwall and Wales, and gave no further disturbance to the conquerors, the bond of alliance was in a great measure dissolved among the princes of the Heptarchy. Though one prince still seems to have been allowed or to have assumed an ascendancy over the whole, his authority, if it ought ever to be deemed regular or legal, was extremely limited; and each state acted as if it had been independent, and wholly separated from the rest. Wars, therefore, and revolutions and dissensions, were unavoidable among a turbulent and military people." These events ought to belong to the page of history, but the accounts handed down to posterity are as barren as they are uncertain. As Hume goes on to observe:—"The monks, who were the only annalists during those ages, lived remote from public affairs; considered the civil transactions as entirely subordinate to the ecclesiastical; and besides partaking of the ignorance and barbarity which were then universal, were strongly infected with the love of wonder, and with a propensity to imposture, vices almost inseparable from their profession and manner of life. The history of that period abounds in names, but is extremely barren of events; or the events are related so much without circumstances and causes, that the most profound or most eloquent writer must despair of rendering them either instructive or entertaining to the reader. Even the great learning and vigorous imagination of Milton sunk under the weight; and this author scruples not to declare, that the skirmishes of kites or crows as much merited a particular narrative as the confused transactions and battles of the Saxon Heptarchy."

Without adopting the notion, therefore, that there was an acknowledged lord paramount in the Saxon Heptarchy, which appears to be untenable, we shall lay before our readers a succinct narrative of each separate kingdom, beginning with that of Kent, which was the first established, and concluding with that of Wessex, which after a series of remarkable revolutions subdued all the other six kingdoms of the Heptarchy under its dominion.

The kingdom of Kent.—Hengist, the founder of the kingdom of Kent, was succeeded by his son Eric, whose surname was Æsc, or "Ash-tree," whence his successors were denominated Æscingas, or "sons of the Ash-tree." The kingdom was called *Cant wara rice*, the kingdom of the men of Kent; and Durovernum became *Cant wara burh*, whence Canterbury. By some authors Eric is considered to have been the founder of the Kentish kingdom; but it would rather appear that it was under his rule that it became established, he having, it is said, reigned twenty-four years in great tranquillity.

Eric died A.D. 512, leaving his kingdom to his son Octa, in whose reign it was that the East Saxons established their monarchy, dismembering the provinces of Essex and Middlesex from that of Kent. He was succeeded in his kingdom, A.D. 534, by his son Hermenric, of whom little is known except that he reigned thirty-two years, and that before he died he associated his son Ethelbert with him in the government, in order to secure his succession in the family, and to prevent such revolutions as are incident to a turbulent and barbarous monarchy.

Ethelbert was an ambitious and warlike monarch. His aim was to extend his dominion. To that end he engaged in a war with Ceawlin, king of Wessex, in which he was unsuccessful. He was twice defeated; but Ceawlin having, by his subsequent ambitious career, reduced the kingdom of Sussex to subjection, excited the jealousy of the other Saxon princes, an association was formed against him: Ethelbert was entrusted with the command of the allies, and obtained a signal victory. Soon after this event Ceawlin died, and Ethelbert succeeded as well as to his ascendant among the Saxon states, as to his other ambitious projects. All the princes were reduced to his sway except the king of Northumberland. He even established himself on the throne of Mercia; but, apprehensive that a league might be formed against him, as there had been against his old antagonist Ceawlin, he resigned that kingdom to Webba, the son of Crida, who first founded that monarchy, imposing, however, such conditions upon Webba as rendered him little better than a tributary monarch.

The long and prosperous reign of Ethelbert is marked by the introduction of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons, an event which will be recorded at length under the head of Religion. His marriage with Bertha, the only daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, and a descendant of Clovis, the conqueror of Gaul, paved the way for this event; for Bertha was a Christian, and it had been stipulated before the nuptials that she should enjoy the free exercise of her religion, a concession not difficult to be obtained from the idolatrous Saxons. His union with Bertha was in other respects conducive to the welfare of his sub-

for it brought him into connection with the
h and other nations on the Continent, which
tendency to reclaim them from their gross ig-
ce and barbarity. To Ethelbert belongs the
r of enacting a body of laws, the first written
promulgated by any of the northern conquerors.
elbert was succeeded in his kingdom, A.D. 616,
son Eadbald, under whom his subjects relapsed
dolatry. Eadbald conceived a passion for his
r-in-law, and as the Christian faith would not
t an incestuous marriage, he renounced it, and
hole people followed his example. According
monkish historians, however, he was finally
ned from idolatry. They relate that Mellitus
ustus, whom Augustus had consecrated bishops
don and Rochester, left the kingdom in despair,
at Laurentius, the successor of that first Chris-
nissionary, was about to follow their example;
at before he abandoned his dignity he resolved
ke one effort to reclaim the idolatrous monarch.
ode of reclaiming him was original. One day
peared before Eadbald, and throwing off his
ents, he exhibited a body torn with bruises and
s, and on the king expressing surprise that any
ould thus treat a man of his rank, Laurentius
ly told him that St. Peter, the prince of the
es, had appeared to him in a vision, and had
chastised him for his intention to desert his
l charge. Thus convinced of the error of his
Eadbald is recorded to have put away his
r-in-law, and to return to the profession of Chris-
y, his subjects again following his example.
story is no doubt fabulous, but Eadbald does
r to have returned to the faith from some motive
er, and to have died a Christian, A.D. 640.

lbald left two sons, Erminfrid and and Ercom-
He was succeeded in his kingdom by the
, who was his youngest son, and who had mar-
French princess. According to Bede his reign
rked by two notable events—that of establishing
st of Lent in his kingdom, and utterly uprooting
ry. He was succeeded in his kingdom, A.D.
y his son Egbert, who is renowned for his en-
gement of learning, but rendered infamous for
murder of his two cousins, sons of his uncle
afrid. Egbert died A.D. 673, and left the crown
s son Edric, but it was usurped by his own
er Lothaire. In order to secure the power in
mily, Lothaire associated his son Richard with
in the administration of his government. He
rs to have reigned eleven years, when he was
ted and slain in a battle with Edric, the dis-
sed prince, who was assisted by Eidilwach,
of Sussex. Richard fled to Lucca in Tuscany,
dric then mounted the throne. His reign, how-
was brief. He died A.D. 686, and was succeeded
s brother Widrid. At this time, according to
old chroniclers, faction prevailed everywhere
g the nobles of the kingdom of Kent. Cadwallo,
of Wessex, with his brother Mollo, was invited to
the kingdom, and fearful devastations were
itted. Mollo appears to have been the chief
r of the men of Wessex, for when he was slain in
mish, peace is said to have returned to the king-
during which Widrid restored it to its original
prosperity. Widrid reigned thirty-two years, and his descendants, Eadbert, Ethelbert, and Aldric successively mounted the throne. At the death of the latter, A.D. 794, the royal family of Kent was extinguished, and its throne was occupied by whoever could obtain possession of it. One Egbert reigned two years; Cuthred, brother to the king of Mercia, six years; and Baldred, an illegitimate branch of the family of Hengist, eighteen years. At length, however, in the year A.D. 823 the kingdom of Kent was dissolved. Baldred was expelled by Egbert, king of Wessex, by whose good sword the Saxon Heptarchy was uprooted, and its several kingdoms became united under one dominion.

ANGLO-SAXON KING AND ARMOUR-BEARER.

The kingdom of Northumberland.—It was Adelfrid, king of Bernicia, who having married Acca, the daughter of Ella, king of Deira, that united all the counties north of the Humber into one monarchy. Adelfrid acquired a great ascendancy in the Heptarchy. His power was great, and he spread the terror of his arms far and wide. Victories were gained by him over the Picts and Scots and the hardy people of Wales, and the bounds of his dominions were extended on all sides. If the monkish historians are to be credited, he was a merciless conqueror. They relate that on his laying siege to Chester, the Britons marched out with all their forces

to engage him, being attended by a body of twelve hundred and fifty monks from the monastery of Banchor, who came to pray for their success, and to encourage them by their presence and exhortations. But these fierce pagan Saxon chiefs had no respect for priests. It is probable that they feared their influence with the people as much as the Romans had feared that of the Druids. On discovering the purport of their presence, that they had come to pray against him, Adelfrid sent a detachment against them, and all, it is recorded, except fifty, were slain. The Britons were defeated, Chester surrendered, and the monastery of Banchor was razed to the ground.

In order to keep quiet possession of the kingdom of Deira, Adelfrid had expelled the infant brother of his wife Acca, and he had become a wanderer. At length, however, that young prince, Edwin, found protection in the court of Redwald, king of the East Angles. Redwald was solicited by Adelfrid either to slay or give up his guest, promising him rich rewards for such a service. It is said that Redwald at one time contemplated yielding to the temptation, and to take the blood money: but that his queen, charmed with Edwin's accomplishments, saved her husband's honour. Be that as it may, Redwald espoused the cause of Edwin, and marching suddenly into Northumbria, fought a battle with Adelfrid on the banks of the river Idel in Nottinghamshire, in which that monarch was slain, and Edwin succeeded him on the Northumbrian throne.

On being restored to his paternal inheritance, Edwin rose to greater power than had ever been possessed by any Anglo-Saxon monarch. He became the greatest prince in the Heptarchy. If there was a lord paramount he succeeded to that dignity about A.D. 621. It seems clear that by his success in war with the king of Wessex, that he acquired authority over nearly all the country from the Thames to the Firth of Forth. He transferred, indeed, the ascendancy from the south to the north of the island. His reign appears to have been beneficial to his subjects. "In this time," Fabyan the old chronicler says, "a woman might have gone from one town to another without grief or molestation; and for the refreshing of waygoers Edwin ordained at clear wells, cups or dishes of brass or iron, to be fastened standing by the said wells' sides; and no man was so hardy as to take away those cups, he kept so good justice."

After his accession to the crown Edwin married Ethelburga, the daughter of Ethelbert, king of Kent. Following the example of her mother Bertha, that princess sought the conversion of her husband to Christianity. It was stipulated that she should enjoy the free exercise of her religion, and she carried with her into Northumbria, Paulinus, a bishop, to aid her in her attempt to convert her pagan husband. There was long wavering in the monarch's mind on this subject. He would, he said, examine the foundations of that doctrine, and if he found them satisfactory he would be converted. After a long and serious inquiry Edwin declared in favour of the Christian religion, and his subjects soon after followed his example. It was after his conversion that Pope Boniface, in a letter addressed to him, A.D. 625, styled him "King of the Angles or English."

Edwin reigned till the year A.D. 634, when he perished in a great battle fought at Hatfield, between the Don and the Trent, with Penda, king of the Mercians, and Cadwalladar, king of North Wales, who had formed a league against him. His conversion to Christianity appears to have been one of the chief causes of this league, for Penda was a ferocious partisan of the Saxon superstition. His victory was marked by after desolation. The triumphant pagan forces ravaged the Northumbrian kingdom, sparing neither old men nor children, women nor monks; the latter especially suffering from his vengeance.

At the death of Edwin the Northumbrian monarchy became divided. Eanfrid, the son of Adelfrid, took possession of his paternal kingdom of Bernicia; and Osric, Edwin's cousin-german, established himself in Deira. Both these princes returned to paganism, and it seems probable that the whole people returned with them, as Paulinus, who was the first archbishop of York, retired with Ethelburga into Kent. The reigns of these kings, however, was but of short duration. Eanfrid fell in battle with Cadwalladar, the Briton; and Oscar was treacherously slain by that prince. Oswald, the brother of Eanfrid, now once more united the kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, A.D. 634, and restored the Christian religion in his dominions, the Saxons being ever ready to adopt the faith of their monarch, whether pagan or Christian. Cadwalladar had remained in Northumbria, and his successes appear to have made him despise precaution, for Oswald surprised him at Hexham with an inferior force, and he was defeated and slain. Having restored peace he devoted his wealth to the erection of churches and monasteries. Civilization was making rapid progress in his kingdom through the medium of Christianity, but that fierce enemy of the Christian faith, Penda, was still alive, and once more he entered Northumbria to check its progress. Like his uncle Edwin, Oswald was slain in battle with that fierce pagan monarch, A.D. 642.

The Northumbrians still rallied round the family of Edwin. On the retreat of Penda from Northumbria, Oswy, the brother of Oswald and husband of a daughter of the great Edwin, ascended the throne, uniting the two kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, by putting to death Oswin, the son of Osric, the last king of the race of Deira. His succession, however, was not undisputed. In the year 651 his kingdom was re-divided into its two ancient states, Oswy retaining Bernicia, and Odenwald reigning in Deira. Nor was Oswy long permitted to reign in peace in Bernicia. After driving Kynegils, the Christian king of Wessex, from his throne, A.D. 652, Penda again entered Northumbria with fire and sword, burning and slaying wherever he came. Oswy purchased peace this time by means of rich presents, hostages, and an arrangement of intermarriage. His eldest son Alchfrid was espoused to Penda's daughter, and shortly after, Penda's son, Peada, married Oswy's daughter, Alchfreda, that "fair and Christian princess" who carried four priests in her train, and became instrumental in the conversion of the people of Mercia. Penda, however, but little regarded these family ties; he was still the bitter opposer of the Christian faith, and the fierce upholder of Saxon

paganism. He again advanced into Northumbria, his army being swelled by the forces of thirty vassal chieftains, Welsh as well as Saxon. A great battle was fought near York, in the year 654, and this time victory declared for the Northumbrians; Penda was slain, and the vassal chieftains perished almost to a man. According to the custom of the age Oswy made a rich donation of lands, and founded twelve abbeys in testimony of his gratitude. He also dedicated an infant daughter to the Lady of Hilda, who shortly after removed from Hartlepool to the vale of Whitby, where she founded one of the most famous monasteries of the middle ages.

Oswy, after the death of Penda, appears to have inflicted a cruel vengeance on his old enemies the Mercians. All their territories, north and south, were attached to the Northumbrian kingdom. He did not, however, long maintain his ascendancy in Mercia. In the year 656 its nobles took up arms against him, and compelled the Northumbrians to retire from their country. Oswy was further weakened by the ambition of his son Alchfrid, who demanded and obtained a part of Northumbria in separate and independent sovereignty. In the latter part of his reign a great plague ravaged the country. It commenced in the year 664, and its ravages continued for twenty years, passing from south to north, and desolating not only England, but the highlands of Scotland and Ireland.

Oswy died A.D. 670, and was succeeded by his son Egfrid. That monarch was ambitious of obtaining all that his father had held in Mercia, and a struggle ensued, the final result of which was the weakening of both kingdoms. In the year A.D. 685, Egfrid was slain in a war with Brude, king of the Picts, and from that time the Northumbrian kingdom became a scene of wretched anarchy. He was succeeded by Alfred, his natural brother, who, after reigning nineteen years, was succeeded by his son Osred, a boy eight years of age. Osred, after reigning eleven years, was murdered by his kinsman Kenred, who, after enjoying the crown only one year, perished by a similar fate. The next kings were Osric, and Celwulph, the son of Kenred; the latter of whom, A.D. 738, resigned the crown to his cousin Eadbert, and retired to a monastery. Soon after, Eadbert followed his example, abdicating the crown in favour of his son Oswolf, who, at the end of the first year of his reign, was slain in a sedition. Mollo, who was not of the royal family, now seized the crown, and he perished by the treachery of Ailred, a prince of the blood, who, after enjoying a brief reign, was expelled by his subjects. Ethelred, the son of Mollo, the next king, underwent a similar fate; and Celwold, his successor, who was the brother of Ailred, was deposed and slain by the people. Osred, the nephew of Ailred, next reigned, but only for a year, and his successor Ethelbert, another son of Mollo, died a violent death like his predecessors. By these fatal revolutions, the people of Northumbria lost all attachment to their government and princes, and they finally submitted to the rule of Egbert of Wessex.

The kingdom of East Anglia.—The history of this kingdom presents no very remarkable events. The most memorable is that of the conversion of Earpwold, its fourth king, and great-grandson of Offa, the founder of the monarchy. He was induced to embrace Christianity by Edwin, king of the Northumbrians; but his wife, who was an idolatress, brought him back to paganism. After his death, which was tragical, Sigebert, his successor, restored Christianity and introduced learning among the East Angles, he having imbibed a love of learning from being educated in France. Beyond this the history of East Anglia consists of barren details of princes who were either murdered or deposed, or who inherited from each other and obscurely filled the throne of that kingdom. Its last monarch, Ethelbert, was murdered by Offa, king of the Mercians, A.D. 782, and his kingdom was henceforth united to that of Mercia.

The kingdom of Mercia.—Mercia was the largest kingdom of the Heptarchy, comprehending the middle counties of England. For some time it appears to have been under the authority of Ethelbert, the king of Kent, although the succession was in the race of its first founder, Crida. After Crida, its first monarch was his son Webba, who, being placed on his throne by Ethelbert, governed the kingdom by a precarious authority. After his death, by the influence of Ethelbert his kinsman Ceorl mounted the throne, he being preferred to his son Penda, whose turbulent character appeared dangerous to the Kentish monarch. When fifty years of age, however, Penda succeeded to the throne of Mercia, and his reign justified the opinion which Ethelbert had formed of his fitness for rule. Three kings of East Anglia and two of Northumbria perished in battle against him, and, as before recorded, he was at length himself slain in battle with Oswy, king of the Northumbrians. He was succeeded in his throne, A.D. 655, by his son Peada, who had espoused a daughter of Oswy, through whose influence he introduced Christianity into Mercia. Peada died a violent death, and was succeeded in the government by his son Wulfere, who reduced the kingdoms of Essex and East Anglia to his subjection. His successor, Ethelred his brother, is represented as a lover of peace. He, however, made a successful expedition into Kent, and repulsed Egfrid, king of the Northumbrians, who invaded his dominions. Ethelred appears to have had a tender conscience, which was not a characteristic of the Saxon chieftains. Having slain Elfwin, the brother of Egfrid, in battle, he compounded the deed, and made peace with that monarch by a money payment. After reigning thirty years he resigned his crown to Kendred, son of Wulfere, and retired into a monastery; and Kendred gave up the crown to Ceolred, the son of Ethelred, and went to Rome, where he passed his life in acts of penance and devotion. Ceolred was succeeded by Ethelbald, grandson of Alwy, the brother of Penda; and he being slain in a mutiny, was succeeded by Offa, a descendant of another brother of Penda named Eawa.

Offa ascended the throne of Mercia, A.D. 755. That monarch was an ambitious warrior. Between the years A.D. 757-794 he was engaged in many bloody wars. He defeated Lothaire, king of Kent, in a battle at Otford upon the Darent, and reduced his kingdom to a state of dependence; and Kenwulf, king of Wessex, at Bensington in Oxfordshire; after which he annexed both that county and Gloucestershire to his dominions.

But his career was marked with crime as well as victory. Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, desired a union with his daughter Elfrida, and Offa invited him to Hereford with his retinue, to solemnize the nuptials, and amidst the joy and festivity displayed on this occasion, he was seized by the treacherous monarch and secretly beheaded. Warned by Elfrida, the nobles of East Anglia escaped, but Offa, having slain the last of the race of Crida, succeeded in his design of subduing that kingdom. Offa sought to re-establish his character in the eyes of the world, and to appease his conscience according to the fashion of the age, he gave the tenth of his goods to the church; bestowed rich donations on the cathedral of Hereford; made a pilgrimage to Rome to procure absolution; and engaged to pay the sovereign pontiff a yearly donation for the support of an English college in that city. His hypocrisy or penitence, whichever it might be, did not end here. Pretending to be directed by a vision from heaven, he discovered the reliques of St. Alban the martyr, at Verulamium, and endowed a magnificent monastery in that place. So munificent were his acts of piety, that William of Malmesbury was puzzled to decide as to whether his crimes or his merits preponderated. Offa, who has written his name upon the great dyke reaching from Chester to the Wye, died A.D. 795.

After the death of Offa, the power which he had established in Mercia quickly faded away. He was succeeded by his son Egfrith, who only reigned five months, when the crown devolved upon Kenulph, a descendant of the royal family. Kenulph waged war with Egbert, king of Kent, and having taken him prisoner barbarously put out his eyes and gave the crown of Kent to his own brother Cuthred. He was slain in an insurrection of the East Anglians, and was succeeded in his kingdom by his son Kenelm, who, during the first year of his reign, was murdered by his own sister Quendrade. That guilty woman hoped by the bloody deed she had committed to mount the throne, but she was supplanted by her uncle Ceolulf, who, after reigning two years, was dethroned by Beornulf. That usurper was defeated by the West Saxons, and killed by his own subjects; and Ludican, his successor, shared the same fate. The last monarch of Mercia was Wiglaff, who was overthrown by Egbert, and his kingdom was added to that of Wessex.

The kingdom of Essex.—Of this kingdom of the Heptarchy very little is recorded. The founder of the monarchy, Ercewine, was succeeded by his son Sebert, who, under the influence of his uncle Ethelbert, king of Kent, embraced Christianity. At his death his kingdom was ruled conjointly by his two sons, who relapsed into idolatry, and who, according to Bede, expelled Mellitus, the bishop, because he would not suffer them, as pagans, to eat the white bread distributed at the communion. The names of other princes who reigned successively in Essex are, Sigebert the Little, Sigebert the Good (who restored Christianity), Swithelm, Sigheri, Offa, and Selred. This last prince reigned thirty-eight years, and was the last descendant of Ercewine. At his death the kingdom of Essex fell into a state of anarchy, and was easily subjected to the power of Wessex. Three kings ruled under the Mercian monarchs—Switherd, Sigeric, and Sigered—but the kingdom finally submitted to the rule of Egbert.

The kingdom of Sussex.—This kingdom was the smallest in the Heptarchy, and makes no figure in history. Its founder, Ella, was succeeded by his son Cissa, who is said to have reigned seventy-six years. As early as his reign, the South Saxons appear to have fallen into an almost absolute dependence on the kingdom of Wessex: so much so, indeed, that the very names of the princes who enjoyed the titular sovereignty are for the most part unknown. Its last king, Adelwalch, was subdued in battle by Ceadwalla, king of Wessex, and was slain; and though the nobles of Sussex resisted that monarch's power for some time longer, the kingdom was finally amalgamated with that of Wessex. The subjugation of the kingdom of Sussex was, indeed, the first step which the West Saxons made towards reducing the other six kingdoms of the Heptarchy under their sole dominion.

The kingdom of Wessex.—It has been seen that the founder of this kingdom, which finally reduced all the other Saxon states, was Cerdic. At his death, he was succeeded on his throne by his valiant son, Kenric, who had been the companion of all his father's toils and victories. During his reign of twenty-six years he appears to have carried on a fierce war with the Britons, over whom he is said to have gained several victories. Kenric died A.D. 360, and his son, Cewaulin, assumed the sceptre, a prince more ambitious and enterprising than even Cerdic and Kenric. By great victories obtained over the Britons, and especially in a great battle fought at Durham in Gloucestershire, in which three British princes were slain, he added the counties called Devonshire and Somersetshire to his dominions. Nor was it with the Britons alone that he fought. He invaded the Saxon states in his neighbourhood, and dreading his ambition, a confederacy was formed against him, into which some of the Britons entered. Ethelbert, king of Kent, was at the head of this confederacy, and it was successful: Cewaulin was defeated A.D. 591, and, to complete his misfortune, his own subjects revolted and drove him into exile. He was succeeded in his kingdom by his nephew Ceolric, who reigned five years, when dying he left his throne to his brother Ceolwulf, who warred, during his reign of fourteen years, not only with the Britons, but with his kindred the Saxons, and the Picts and Scots. Upon the death of Ceolwulf, A.D. 611, Kynegils, the son of Ceolric, inherited the crown, associating his brother Quicelm in the government of his kingdom. These two princes, who appear to have been renowned for their fraternal affection, gained a great victory over the Britons, who still struggled for independence at Beamdune, now Bampton, in Devonshire. Under the influence of Oswald, king of Northumbria, who had married his daughter, Kynegils embraced Christianity. He died A.D. 643, and his son Kenwalch succeeded to the monarchy. This monarch was married to a sister of the inveterate pagan Penda, and soon after his accession he obtained a divorce from her, probably from the circumstance that while he had embraced the Christian faith, his queen still adhered to paganism. At all events the circumstance brought down upon him Penda's fierce vengeance. He invaded the dominions of Kenwalch,

and after defeating him in several battles, compelled him to abandon his country. He took refuge in East Anglia, where he lived in exile for three years, at the end of which time he recovered his kingdom, which he defended with great valour and success to the day of his death, A.D. 672.

As Kenwalch died without issue, the succession was disputed. After his divorce from the sister of Penda he had married Sexburga, who was a woman of great spirit and ability. Sexburga kept possession of the chief authority for two years, when, at her death, Escwin, a prince of the race of Cerdic, acquired the crown; carrying off the prize from his competitor, Kentwin, the brother of Kenwalch. Escwin died A.D. 676, and Kentwin then became monarch of the West Saxons. That monarch chiefly employed his arms against the Britons of Cornwall and Somersetshire, in which he was victorious. He died A.D. 685, and was succeeded by Ceodwalla, who, according to the idea of the times, was a great prince. He enlarged his dominions by the entire reduction of the kingdom of Sussex, and made destructive inroads into that of Kent. In one of these enterprises he lost his brother Mollo, who, with all his attendants, fell into the hands of the enemy, and was slain. Like all the other Saxon wars, those of Ceodwalla appear to have been carried on remorselessly. His cruelties, according to the old chroniclers, weighed heavily on his conscience, and to gain relief, he, too, endowed churches and made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he received baptism, and where he died A.D. 689. His cousin Ina now mounted the throne, a prince as renowned for his justice, policy, and prudence, as he was for his skill in war. Ina made the conquest of Cornwall and Somersetshire, but he treated the vanquished Britons with a humanity no Saxon conqueror had before displayed; for he allowed the proprietors to retain their lands, and encouraged alliances and marriages between them and his Saxon subjects. Ina reigned thirty-seven years; and his reign must be regarded as one of the most glorious and most prosperous of the Heptarchy. Indeed, the early part of the eighth century appears to have been the most peaceful period of the history of Britain since the arrival of the Saxons. The storms which had agitated the natives inhabiting the island for several ages, were at least for a time hushed to peace.

In the decline of life, Ina made a pilgrimage to Rome, and on his return embraced the monastic life. He resigned his crown to Adelard, brother of Ethelburga his queen, who was one of the race of Cerdic, but in a remote degree. His succession, however, was contested. Oswald, a prince more nearly allied to the crown, took up arms; but he was defeated, and Adelard reigned in profound peace till his death, A.D. 741.

The peace which had for some years prevailed in Britain was now again succeeded by wars. Cuthred, the cousin of Adelard, assumed the crown of Wessex, and his reign was marked with wars either against Ethelbald, king of Mercia, or in conjunction with that king against the Britons. A great victory was obtained by him in A.D. 752 over Ethelbald, and shortly after he obtained another equally great over the Britons. He did not long survive these victories. He died A.D. 754, and his cousin Sigebert ascended the throne. That king's reign was brief. By his pride and cruelty he provoked an insurrection, and he was driven in the following year from his kingdom. It is said that he took refuge with Duke Cumbran, governor of Hampshire, who gave him many salutary counsels for his future conduct, mingled with reproofs for the past, and that in revenge Sigebert murdered him; after which, forsaken by all the world, he took shelter in the forest of Anderida, where he was discovered by a swineherd in the service of Cumbran, who put him to death. The insurrection against Sigebert was headed by Kenwulf, who obtained the crown. Kenwulf made several successful expeditions against the Britons of Cornwall; but venturing on a war with the renowned Offa, on whose successes against some of the Saxon states he looked with a jealous eye, he was signally defeated at Bensington in Oxfordshire. Kenwulf was treacherously murdered, A.D. 784, by Kynehard, brother of the deposed Sigebert, and Brithric, who was remotely descended from the royal family, obtained possession of the crown: although Egbert, a descendant of Ingald, brother to King Ina, was the legitimate successor to the throne.

ANCIENT ARMOUR.

Conscious that his title was invalid, Brithric married Eadburgha, a natural daughter of Offa, king of Mercia, in the hope of establishing his power. With the same view he sought to obtain possession of the person of Egbert, who, aware of his danger, fled to the court of Charlemagne in France, by whom he was well received. Eadburgha was a profligate woman, and was equally infamous for her cruelty as for her incontinence. Acting under her influence, Brithric destroyed several nobles who were obnoxious to her; and if she failed in any instance to incite him to murder, she encompassed their deaths herself. Against one young nobleman who had acquired her husband's friendship, she entertained a mortal antipathy. Resolving, therefore, upon his ruin, she mixed a cup of poison for him, of which he drank and died; Brithric, however, partook of the deadly potion with his favourite, and he perished with him. After this tragedy Eadburgha fled to France, and Egbert returned from thence to fill the throne of Wessex.

On his return to Wessex, Egbert was received by the thanes, nobles, and people, with open arms. He had been popular among them before his departure for France, and his absence appears to have increased his popularity. And no wonder. His residence with Charlemagne had been of the greatest service to him. Under that able instructor, in whose armies he had fought, he had not only learned the art of war, but the still more difficult art of ruling a kingdom; for Charlemagne was great in the battle-field and in the council chamber. As the French were at that time far more polished than the Saxons, Egbert had also acquired many accomplishments among them: all which tended to increase his people's admiration, and engage their affections.

It was a critical period with all the other kingdoms of the Heptarchy, when Egbert ascended the throne of Wessex. That of Sussex had for some time been annexed to it; as that of East Anglia had been to Mercia. The kings of Kent and Essex, also, were tributaries to the Mercian monarchs; so that only two powerful kingdoms remained besides Wessex: namely, Mercia and Northumbria, and these had been greatly weakened by the unsettled state of their government, and contests about the succession. Egbert, however, does not appear to have formed any designs upon these kingdoms: on the contrary, his contest for dominion over the whole of the Saxon kingdoms was brought about by the provocations of those he conquered. The first years of his reign were spent in promoting the prosperity of his subjects, and in establishing his authority over the Britons in Cornwall and Devonshire. Many a victory was gained by him over the indomitable Britons, in the heart of their country; and he was yet warring with them when he was recalled from his conquest by an invasion upon his own kingdom.

Before his accession, Bernulf, king of Mercia, had been ambitious of obtaining the absolute sovereignty in the Heptarchy. The power and prosperity of Egbert alarmed that monarch, and, taking advantage of his absence, he marched his forces into Wessex. It was a fatal step to his own power and dominion. Egbert led his army against the invaders, and meeting them at Ellundun, now Wilton, in Wiltshire, they sustained a signal overthrow. Henry of Huntingdon says that "Eleundune's stream was tinged with blood, and was choked with the slain, and became foul with the carnage;" adding that "the fat, corpulent, and short-winded Mercians were no match for the lean, meagre, pale, and long-winded people of Wessex." Egbert's victory was so decisive that he met with little further opposition in the conquest of Mercia and its dependencies. The tributary kingdoms of Kent and Essex readily submitted; and the East Angles threw off the Mercian yoke, and placed themselves under his protection. It was in vain that Bernulf and his successor, Ludican, sought to recover East Anglia: both lost their lives in the attempt. Egbert now advanced into the centre of the Mercian territories, and readily completed the conquest of that kingdom. Wiglaf, its last monarch, was compelled to abandon his throne; and upon his retreat to his hiding-place—a cell in Croyland Abbey—all opposition ceased, and Egbert became sole monarch of all England south of the Humber. Only one kingdom now remained besides that of Wessex—that of Northumbria; and, flushed with victory, Egbert crossed the Humber to subject it to his sway. But there was no fighting. That kingdom was in no condition to resist his arms, and its thanes and nobles met him at Dore in Yorkshire, and swore allegiance to him as their sovereign; Eanred, their king, becoming his vassal and tributary.

Thus in the year A.D. 827, about three hundred and seventy-eight years after the arrival of the Saxons in our island, the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, after numerous revolutions and counter-revolutions, became united under one monarch—Egbert—from whom a long line of kings and princes, many of whom shine with lustre in the bead-roll of history, have descended; reaching even to our own age.

During this period the history of the Britons in Cornwall, Wales, and Cumbria, is involved in obscurity. They were still governed by petty chieftains, who were too much absorbed in their own quarrels to cause much disturbance to their common enemies the Saxons. The most powerful of them was Cadwallon, who defeated Edwin, king of Northumbria, in battle. After his death, A.D. 635, the Britons appear to have lost all hope of recovering their country from the Saxons: some battles were fought by them, but, as previous pages show, they were uniformly defeated. From about the commencement of the eighth century they appear to have been under some subjection to the West Saxon kings, although their chieftains still retained a show of authority. Those who lived between the Bristol Channel and the river Dee were driven into the mountains of Wales by Offa, king of Mercia, where they were governed by petty kings, of whom little is known; while those who lived along the west coasts, from the Dee to the Frith of Forth, were, during the flourishing state of the Northumbrian kingdom, under the dominion of its Saxon monarchs. They recovered their liberty for a brief period, but were finally subdued: some by the Picts and Scots, and the remainder by the victorious Egbert.

Equally obscure is the history of the Scots during this period; while that of the Picts is almost unknown.

Aidan, king of Scots, who died A.D. 605, was succeeded by his son, Eoach Buydhe, or Eoach "the yellow," so called from the colour of his hair. Some historians represent this prince as continually warring either with the Picts or Saxons; while others assert that he was a peaceful monarch. If it is true that he hospitably entertained the seven sons of Ethelred, and Ebba, his daughter, when they fled into Scotland in A.D. 617, the latter view of his character appears to be the correct one. Eoach Buydhe, whom modern historians name Eugenius, died A.D. 622, and was succeeded by his son Ferebar, of whom nothing is recorded; and he in the year A.D. 632 left the throne to Dovenald Breach, or "Donald the Speckled." Up to the time of this prince the sons of Ethelred appear to have remained guests of the kings of Scotland, for he is said to have assisted them in returning into Northumbria, and recovering their paternal dominions. He died A.D. 646, leaving his kingdom to his nephew Ferchs Fada, or Fercher the Long, who, dying in the year A.D. 664, was succeeded by his cousin Maldwin. It

was in the reign of this king—who is represented as a wise, good, and peaceable monarch—that the pestilence called the "yellow," before mentioned, raged in all the nations of Europe, except among the Picts and Scots. From the death of Aidan to that of Maldwin, who died A.D. 684, a period of seventy-nine years, there was constant peace between the Scots and Saxons: a circumstance very remarkable, when it is considered that both were of a fierce and warlike disposition. In the first part of the period this peace seems to have arisen from the exhaustion of the Scots after the victory gained over Aidan by the Saxons in A.D. 603, and from the constant wars of the Saxons with each other; and, in the latter part of the period, to the cordial friendship which had been engendered between the two nations, from the long residence of the sons of Ethelred at the Scottish court. Maldwin appears to have been succeeded in the kingdom by Eochol Renneval, or Eugenius IV.; but of him and his three immediate successors nothing is recorded, except that they were at war with the Picts, though no great battles were fought between the two nations. Heatagan, the son of Findan, who began to reign A.D. 698, is said to have ended all disputes between the Picts and Scots by marrying a Pictish princess. Heatagan died A.D. 715, and was succeeded by his nephew Murdoch, who occupied the throne to the year 730. The reigns of these princes were marked by a profound peace. According to Bede, at that time the Picts had formed a friendship with the Saxons; the Scots were contented with their own territories; and the Britons had sunk into a state of tranquillity, some under their own princes, and others under the Saxon dominion. On the death of Murdoch, his son Ewen ascended the throne, but of him and his successors down to the year 787 nothing remarkable is recorded. At that time Eochol, who is named Achaius by later Scotch historians, became king of the Scots, and he survived the period to which this section is devoted. Achaius appears to have been one of the most illustrious princes of this period in the Scottish dynasty. It is supposed that he formed an alliance with Charlemagne, king of France; and it is certain that he entered into a treaty of alliance and commerce with Offa, king of Mercia. That he was at peace with the Picts is evident, for he married a sister of Hungus the Pictish monarch, by whom he had a son named Alpine, who, on the failure of the male line of that dynasty, became heir to the Pictish crown.

As regards the civil and military history of the Pictish monarchy during this period, it would be vain to attempt any narration. From the beginning of the seventh century to the year 684 it is entirely lost, except the names of some of their kings; and what little is known of their subsequent history is recorded incidentally in the previous narrative. In the latter period of the eighth century the Pictish monarchy appears to have been in a flourishing condition; but no ancient chronicler has narrated the particulars of events, and modern historians must therefore sink the subject in their pages.

SECTION III.

Egbert.—We have now arrived at one of the most eventful periods in the history of our world-famous island—the establishment of the English monarchy. The victorious Egbert, however, did not at once assume the title of king of England, but continued to style himself "king of the West Saxons." But that he was absolute "monarch of all he surveyed," notwithstanding, is clear; for his authority became predominant in all parts of the country, from the Channel to the Tweed—Cumbria alone excepted. Even that part of Britain might probably have been added to his dominions; for soon after the overthrow of the Saxon Heptarchy, he marched his army into North Wales and overran the whole country as far as Snowdon, and only desisted from its conquest by finding that his own throne was in danger: not from any internal commotion, but from a formidable enemy which now appeared on the coast of Britain—the Dane, an enemy which came to repeat to the Anglo-Saxons, in a far more terrible manner, the lesson of disturbance which the Britons had received from the followers of *their* chieftains, on the establishment of the Saxon Heptarchy.

The enemy which Egbert was called on to encounter are variously styled by our own annalists, Danes, Norsemen, and Northmen; by the French, Normans; and by the Italians, Normanni. Issuing from the rude coasts of Scandinavia and the countries spread around the Baltic, they extended their devastations to the sunny land of the Mediterranean, and founded states in Italy and France. They had defied the power of Charlemagne the Great; for in his days they had pillaged the coasts of France to such an extent that he was moved to shed prophetic tears when he saw their piratical flag in the Mediterranean. The Danes were a nation of pirates, and their home was on the sea. Bands of these marauders were organized in their northern homes, and sent forth in ships under the command of vikings, the sons of their aristocracy, to plunder the happier lands of the south. Their system of invasion has been thus naïvely described by Henry of Huntingdon:—"It was wonderful how, when the English kings were hastening to encounter them in the eastern district, before they could fall in with the enemy's bands, a hurried messenger would arrive and say, 'Sir king, whither are you marching? The heathens have disembarked from a countless fleet, on the southern coast, and are ravaging the towns and villages in every quarter.' The same day another messenger would come running and say, 'Sir king, whither are you retreating? A formidable enemy has landed in the west of England; and if you do not quickly turn your face towards them, they will think you are fleeing, and follow in your rear with fire and sword.' Again the same day, or on the morrow, another messenger would arrive, saying, 'O noble chiefs, what place are you making for? The Danes have made a descent in the north; already they have burnt your mansions; even now they are sweeping away your goods; they are tossing your young children raised on the points of their spears; your wives, some they have forcibly dishonoured, others they have carried away.'" This picture is illustrative of the

cruel barbarism of these Northmen, as well as of their mode of attack. No sooner had the path to regions where plunder might be obtained been discovered, than they came in shoals of small vessels, in which they could penetrate narrow rivers; and fields crimsoned with the blood of the slain, and fires which sent up their lurid flames skyward, marked their devastating course. Their very religion increased their thirst for slaughter and rapine. That was identical with the paganism of the Saxons; and glorying in the name of Odin, they regarded the conversion of the Saxons to Christianity as a sufficient cause for wide-spread massacre. A reference to the creed of the slain gave a zest to the strains which celebrated their forays:—"We have sung them the mass of lances: it commenced early in the morning; it lasted until night."

Such were the terrible foes Egbert was recalled from his conquests in Cumbria to encounter. It was not their first appearance in the island. In the year 787 a small band of these destructive sea-rovers appeared on the coast, with a view of learning the state of the country; and had killed one of Brithric's officers, who went among them to inquire who they were, whence they came, and what was their design in landing. Six years after, another band landed on the coast of Northumberland and killed many of the inhabitants, and plundered the monastery of Lindisfarne, or Holy Island. The next year a third band appeared on the same coasts, and pillaged the monastery of Wearmouth. On this latter occasion a storm arose and destroyed many of their ships, and while some were drowned, others were captured and summarily beheaded by the Northumbrian people. From that time till the year 832, the island had rest from the Danish marauders. At that time they landed in the Isle of Sheppey, and having plundered it, returned unmolested. The next summer they came again, and were encountered by Egbert at Charmouth in Dorsetshire, but he was defeated with great loss, and with difficulty effected his own escape. This disaster roused Egbert to concert vigorous measures against them. They had returned to their ships and their homes, but it was only to increase their forces. Vigorous measures, therefore, were necessary, the more so because, in cruising along the coast of Cornwall, they had made acquaintance with the descendants of the ancient Britons, who had never been completely subjugated, and an alliance was formed between them. In the year 835, the united forces of the Danes and Britons marched into Devonshire, but Egbert met them at Hengsdown Hill, and defeated them with great slaughter. This was his last exploit. Egbert died A.D. 836, leaving the government to be conducted by feebler hands when skill and bravery were most required.

Ethelwulf.—Egbert was succeeded by his eldest son, Ethelwulf, a prince of singular incapacity for government. Originally intended for the service of the church, he was better fitted for governing a convent than a kingdom. One of his first acts was to appoint his monkish tutor, Swithun, to the see of Winchester, he holding at the same time the office of chancellor. It was probably under the guidance of this monk—who is chiefly remarkable for leaving a name which from that age has been associated with rainy summers—that he gave the kingdom of Kent, with its dependencies, Sussex and Essex, to his son Athelstane, in separate sovereignty. His power was further weakened by the revolt of the Mercians, who under his feeble rule re-established their independence.

This divided sovereignty was fatal to unity of action in the defence of the country. The Danes, under their terrible vikings, ranged over the English channel almost at pleasure. Their visits now became annual, or even more frequent. All the southern coasts were ravaged by them, and they sailed up the Thames and the Medway, and stormed and pillaged London, Rochester, and Canterbury. For the first time, in the year 851, they wintered in the Isle of Thanet. Their ravages induced Ethelwulf, and Barhulf, king of Mercia, to unite their forces to check them. Barhulf was slain, but Ethelwulf and his son Ethelbald are said to have gained a victory over them, at Oakley in Surrey. But if they gained a victory, it was dearly purchased: "the warriors fell on both sides, like corn in harvest." The Danes were afterwards checked at Sandwich in Kent, and by the men of Devon, at Wenbury; and as the disordered state of France favoured their incursions in that country, they suspended their attacks on England. Their departure was followed by an invasion of the Britons of North Wales into Mercia; but they were driven back by Ethelwulf, who hastened to the assistance of his son-in-law Burthred, its tributary king, and the Britons were pursued into their own country.

This was Ethelwulf's last military exploit. During this respite he made a pilgrimage to Rome. He was a welcome guest at Rome, for after the manner of the times he enriched both the pope and the clergy by liberal donations. He was accompanied in his pilgrimage by his youngest son Alfred, who, with weak partiality, he had appointed his successor, and who received the anointing oil from the hands of the pontiff. Ethelwulf spent ten months at Rome, during which time the seeds of discontent were sown broadcast throughout his kingdom. He had married Osburga, who, like himself, belonged to the race of Cerdic, and by whom he had five sons and a daughter. On his route back from Rome, he imprudently contracted a second marriage with Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald. This act was fatal to his peace, but he increased his danger by causing Judith to be crowned queen in the cathedral of Rheims. By the laws of Wessex, which were enacted in consequence of the crimes of Eadburgha, the queenly dignity had been abolished; and this act, combined with the unjust repudiation of Osburga, gave rise to a plot for his dethronement. His son Ethelbald and the thanes and men of Wessex broke out into open revolt; and when Ethelwulf returned to England, he was compelled to resign Wessex to his son Ethelbald, and be content with the little kingdom of Kent. He did not long survive this partition: he died A.D. 857.

Ethelbald and Ethelbert.—By his will, Ethelwulf divided his dominions between his two eldest sons then living—Ethelbald and Ethelbert; the former having the western parts assigned to him, as being the most honourable. He had displayed great courage

in the battle with the Danes at Oakley, and was popular with his subjects; but he incurred public odium by an unlawful marriage with his father's youthful widow, Judith. It is said that the remonstrances of Swithun induced him to consent to a divorce, but it would rather appear that death dissolved the union. He died A.D. 860, and Judith returned to her own country. Subsequently she married the Count of Flanders, and her son espoused Elfrida, the youngest daughter of Alfred: from whom through five descents came Maud, the wife of William the Conqueror, an ancestress of the present reigning family of England.

Ethelbert.—At the death of his brother, Ethelbert became sole monarch of England. During his reign, which was brief, the Danes renewed their incursions. One event commonly assigned to it subsequently proved calamitous to the country. One of the most renowned vikings, Regner Lodbrok, having been wrecked on the north coast, he was captured by the Northumbrians and put to death. Lodbrok is said to have met death with invincible fortitude, and the intelligence of his fate aroused his countrymen to fury, and an avenging armament was speedily prepared for the fearful work of retaliation. That armament was approaching the coasts when Ethelbert died, and his brother Ethelred succeeded to the throne, A.D. 866-7.

Ethelred.—The brief reign of Ethelred forms one of the most sanguinary pages in the English annals. Influenced by the fiercest hostility, the Danes, under the command of the sons of Regner Lodbrok—who burned to avenge his death and to furnish hollow skulls from which he might quaff ale in "the seats of Baldor's father"—they poured into England in great numbers. And this time they resolved on permanently occupying the country. Their aim was no longer plunder, but a real conquest. It was to be a war of extermination; and the fair island of England was to be the home of the Northmen. Their leaders were no longer vikings, but the veritable chiefs of the Danes in person. Under them, in the year 866, a great host landed in East Anglia; and to save themselves from destruction, the East Anglians were compelled to find them winter quarters, and to supply them with horses of the true English breed for their spring campaign. Thus prepared, they marched in A.D. 867 into Northumbria. At that time there was civil war in that country. Osbright and Ella were contending for the government; each being supported by Northumbrian partisans. At the approach of the Danes these competitors laid aside their hostilities and united their forces to resist the common enemy. York had been taken by the Danes, and they attempted its recovery; but both were slain in the attempt. York became the head-quarters of the invaders. In the year 868 they marched into Mercia and took possession of Nottingham. Unable to expel them, Burthred, the tributary king of Mercia, sent for succour to his brother-in-law, Ethelred of Wessex; and, accompanied by his younger brother Alfred, he marched to his assistance. The "house of caves," as Nottingham was called, was besieged by their combined forces, and the Danes quitted it and returned into Northumbria. It does not appear, however, that any victory was gained over them, but rather that their retreat was purchased by what is called in history Danegeld—for the gold of the Saxons was already employed to purchase peace from these restless invaders. But the



NOTTINGHAM CASTLE.

peace thus purchased was not of long duration. In the year 870, the Danes again crossed the Humber: their devastating power rolling onward like a vast engulfing sea which no barrier could stem. They marched through Mercia, marking their way with blood and slaughter. "Their army," says an old chronicler, "rode across Mercia;" and it was a terrible ride for the scattered cultivators and the solitary monasteries of the Fen countries. Once only did they receive a check, and that was but momentary. Under the command of Algar Earl of Holland, Morcard the lord of Brunne, Osgot the sheriff of Lincolnshire, and Tolious, a monk of the abbey of Croyland, a fierce battle was fought with the invaders, who for a brief period gave way: but the Danes quickly rallied, and all the Saxon leaders perished; a few only of their followers escaping the carnage. Those who escaped fled to Croyland, whither they were followed by the Danes. According to the chroniclers of that period, the monks of Croyland were performing matins when the fugitives arrived to tell of their impending destruction; and that while some of the more timid among them took boat to hide themselves in the marshes, the more bold and the aged remained at their altars, where they fell in one general slaughter. Only a little boy escaped, and when Croyland was in flames, he was led away by Sidroc, one of the Danish chiefs. The Danes now marched forward by the ancient roads which crossed the fens to Peterborough; the abbey of which city was famous for its architectural beauty, and its rich library of illuminated manuscript writings of the last two centuries. It was bravely defended by the abbot and monks and people of Peterborough, but in vain: there was great slaughter, and the abbey was razed to the ground. Onward they went, and the abbey of Ely and its inmates shared the same fate as those of Croyland and Peterborough. It was thus that the Danes "rode across Mercia," and came to Thetford.

Thetford was in East Anglia, and the people of that country, finding that submission could not save

them from ruin, now flew to arms. Its king, Edmund, who was a prince of distinguished virtue and piety, had obtained the crown A.D. 855, and had retained it in peace from that period. It was probably the renown Edmund had obtained for piety that marked him out as a victim to the Danes. It is related, that their chiefs Ingvar and Ubba sent messengers to him, demanding that he should abjure his religion, divide his treasures, and reign under their supremacy. This proposal was rejected. "King Edmund fought against them, and the Danes got the victory, and slew the king, and subdued all the land;" razing every minster they came to down to the ground. It would seem that Edmund was taken prisoner; for it is related of his death, that he was bound to a tree, scourged with whips, pierced with arrows, and finally beheaded. His constancy and sufferings raised him to a place in the Martyrology, and in after days the monastery of St. Edmundsbury became one of the most richly endowed in the kingdom: a proof that his memory was held in high veneration for a long period by the Anglo-Saxons.

At this time Northumbria was in the power of the Danes, and East Anglia had fallen under their dominion; Guthrum being appointed to rule over it. The invaders now penetrated into Wessex, and established themselves at Reading. Ethelred marched to dislodge them; his valiant brother Alfred—on whom now rested the destinies of England—burning to rid the country of its fierce invaders, accompanying his army. The Mercians and Northumbrians were summoned to join his forces; but they refused, hoping by his downfall to recover their independence. There was fierce fighting in Wessex between the Danes and Anglo-Saxons. Before Ethelred arrived Ethelwulf the Ealdorman met the Danes at Englefield, and obtained some slight advantage over them; one of their chiefs, Sidroc, being slain in the battle. A succession of battles now rapidly followed. "About three days after," says the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, "King Ethelred and Alfred his brother led a large force to Reading, and fought against the enemy, and there was great slaughter made on either hand." This battle was indecisive: Ethelwulf the Ealdorman was slain, and the Danes possessed the field of carnage. But although the Saxons retreated, they were not conquered. Four days after, Ethelred and Alfred his brother again met the Danes at Æscesdun, or "Ash-tree hills;" the precise locality of which has not been determined, though some fix it at Aston in Berkshire. It was in this battle that Alfred first obtained the character of a great military leader: it was the turning point in his life. According to Asser, the field was not equally advantageous to both sides; for while the Danes occupied the higher ground, the Saxons came up from below. It was around a single thorn tree of stunted growth that the opposing armies met. Ethelred was not in the field at the commencement of the battle; for, says Asser, "he remained a long time in his tent in prayer and hearing mass, declaring that he would not leave it till the priest had done, or abandon the divine protection for that of man." Alfred was as habitually pious as his brother, but *his* present business was to fight. Like "a boar of the woods," he rushed on the Danes, and his passionate onslaught triumphed. The banner of "the white horse" floated triumphantly over the raven. The monk Asser attributes the victory to the prayers of Ethelred, but Alfred was the instrument in gaining it, and henceforth the Saxons looked up to him as their deliverer from the sword of the Danes.

Though thus signally defeated, however, the Northmen were not driven from the island. As long as the fertile lands of the west and the south were to be won, they entertained no thought of shrinking from the contest. Having received reinforcements, they again fought with Ethelred and Alfred at Basing, and were once more successful; and again at Merton, where, though the Saxon brothers were at first victorious, they were compelled to yield the palm of victory to their enemy. The Danes kept possession of the field of slaughter, and returned in triumph to their camp at Reading. Soon after this battle, at Easter, A.D. 871, Ethelred died of a wound received in his last conflicts with the Danes; "leaving," as Hume rightly says, "the inheritance of his cares and misfortunes, rather than of his grandeur, to his brother Alfred."

Alfred.—Alfred, "by the grace of God, assumed the government of the whole realm with the greatest good will of all the inhabitants of the kingdom." So writes the monk Asser; and from the character of Alfred, there is no doubt that he was popular among his Anglo-Saxon subjects. That character for the age in which he lived was a very remarkable one. According to Asser, he was beloved by his father and mother in early childhood, and even by all the people, above all his brothers, and was educated altogether at the court of the king, which was held at Wantage. That education, he says, was neglected till he was twelve years of age, at which time his inborn genius was aroused by the recital of some Saxon poems in which his mother, Osburga, took great delight. He couples this account of the commencement of his education with a story which is evidently fabulous, although historians generally have adopted it as an historical fact. When he was twelve years of age, the story relates, his mother was showing him and his brothers a volume of Saxon poems with illuminated letters, which she promised to give to whichever should soonest learn to recite its contents. Alfred carried the book to his teacher and read it, after which he recited the poems to his mother and received the prize. But if this tale is true, it must have belonged to a much earlier period than that of his *twelfth* year. When he was only five years of age, he had, it is said, been sent to Rome under the care of his *tutor*, the famous Bishop Swithun, and two years after he spent ten months at Rome, then the chief seat of learning, with his father Ethelwulf. Surely, under such a tutor and with such advantages, he could not have been ignorant of the rudiments of education till he had arrived at twelve years of age; a period when it might be supposed that he was about to finish his education. But there are other circumstances which tend to disprove the story told by Asser, and received by historians as a fact in history. He was ten years of age when his father died, and at the death of Ethelbald he was only two years older. Where he was during those two years is not

related, but on the accession of Ethelbert he resided at the court of that brother. His widowed mother might be there, also; but is it to be supposed that he was called upon to compete with his brother the king for a horn-book? That would be presuming that even Ethelbert had been brought up in shameful ignorance, which is contrary to all reason; for a mother like Osburga, who delighted in Saxon literature, would certainly care for the education of her children. But further, Alfred is said to have resided with his brother Ethelbert during his reign — six years—and that all this time he was left without responsibility, except that of self-improvement. Now self-improvement has its basis on rudimental knowledge: and it is clear, therefore, that he must have received the rudiments of education from his tutor Swithun, who, it is said, did not long survive his boyhood. It is, indeed, expressly stated that from the cradle he "loved wisdom above all things." But, whenever Alfred commenced his education, it was not turned to an immediate account. His youth appears to have been spent, not in study, but in winding the horn, bending the bow, and hunting the stag in Selwood forest. At length, however, he was called upon to relinquish his favourite occupations. The flight of years and the dangers of the state brought severer duties; a share in the cares of government and the perils of the battle-field. Under his brother Ethelred he acted as second king; having, indeed, no particular district assigned him, but being invested with a subordinate measure of regal authority. At the age of twenty he married Elswitha, daughter of a Mercian earl; and then it was that, in conjunction with Ethelred, he entered upon that long and arduous contest with the fierce Northmen that has rendered his name so famous in the English annals.

At the time of Alfred's succession, many of his cities, towns, and villages had been reduced to ashes, and his best provinces almost depopulated. The flower of the Anglo-Saxon army had also perished in battle. A man of a less stern mould of mind than him would have given up the contest in despair. His courage, however, remained unabated. His subjects looked upon him as their champion and deliverer, and he was resolved to rescue his country from the Danes, or perish in the struggle for that consummation. And the grave of his brother, at Wimborne in Dorsetshire, had scarcely been covered over when he was called upon to meet his deadly enemy. The Danes had suddenly broke up their camp at Reading, and had marched with rapid strides into Wiltshire. He met them at Wilton, and was defeated, but the conflict was so long and obstinate that the victors were inclined to pause. In one year nine great battles had been fought, and the Saxons were reduced to a small band; but the Danes had suffered also, and they agreed to quit Wessex upon payment of tribute. The Danes retired to London, where they wintered. In the next year, 872, the Mercians submitted to the same humiliating conditions: they also purchased peace by tribute-money. This peace, however, was of brief duration: gold only increased their lust for conquest. In the year 874, the Danes, having in the interval again ravaged East Anglia, returned into Mercia, of which they now became entire masters. Burthred, despairing of saving his country, retired to Rome, where he died.

At this time the Danes in the south had been reinforced by fresh hosts from Northumbria and beyond the seas. Their numbers, indeed, were now so great that they divided; one division under Halfden, or Halfdane, carrying on operations in the north; and the other under Guthrum and two other chieftains, making war in the south. Halfdane was employed in settling Northumbria, and in waging war with the mixed population of the kingdom of Strathclyde, which comprehended Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Galloway: thus coming into collision with the Scots, who were compelled to retreat beyond the Friths of Clyde and Forth. Halfdane divided the mass of the Northumbrian territories among his followers, who, settling among the Anglo-Saxons, by intermarriage with them, became in the lapse of several generations one people.

While Halfdane was pursuing these measures in the north, Guthrum and his fellow-chieftains marched upon Cambridge, which they captured and fortified. By this time, A.D. 876, the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of Northumbria, Mercia, and East Anglia were obliterated: Alfred and the men of Wessex only remained to contest dominion with the Danish invaders. Wessex was the only barrier to their overwhelming power; and the host that had captured and fortified Cambridge, after spending the winter there, took to their ships, and resolved to carry war into the very heart of that kingdom. They landed on the coasts of Dorsetshire, surprised the castle of Wareham, and scoured the neighbouring country. In the interval of peace Alfred had been employed in carrying out a grand idea, which may be considered as the embryo of the naval glory of England. When the Saxons first invaded England, they were as nautical a people as the Danes, but on obtaining dominion they no longer built ships to roam over the sea, but settled down in their new found home as cultivators of the soil. Alfred, however, now turned his attention to the creation of a fleet, by which he hoped to prevent the landing of fresh hordes of Danes, and to cut off supplies from those who had made settlements in the country. Thus engaged, he appears to have neglected to make preparations to meet the Danes when they reappeared in his kingdom, for he was again compelled to purchase peace by tribute-money. The Danes engaged to retire from his territories, but they proved faithless. In the year 877 Exeter was surprised by them and captured. In the meantime, however, Alfred's fleet had gained a victory by sea, the first of a long list of naval battles fought and won by the wooden walls of old England. His flotilla was small, but it was victorious: seven Danish ships were captured, and the rest put to flight. Trifling as it was, this victory was looked upon as a great event. Alfred had retired to Winchester, and the Danes now formed a plan to take him in the rear of this stronghold, and to rouse again the people of Cornwall against the Saxons. A formidable fleet sailed from the mouth of the Thames to reinforce the united troops in Devonshire, but a storm arose which caused the wreck of half their ships, and Alfred's infant navy destroyed the rest as they were approaching the Exe,

and blocked up the harbour. Meanwhile Alfred invested Exeter by land, and Guthrum, who held that town, on hearing of the destruction of his fleet, capitulated, gave hostages, swore by his golden bracelets —which was to the Danes a solemn form of oath— that he would observe the terms of the capitulation, and then retired into Mercia, where he spent the winter.

Old writers term the Danes "truce-breakers," and they well deserved the name. No sooner had Guthrum retreated from Exeter than he commenced preparations for the re-invasion of Wessex. He fixed his head-quarters at Gloucester, whither the "birds of rapine" flocked around the standard of the raven from all quarters. Alfred was at Chippenham, a strong residence of the Wessex kings. It was winter, and hitherto a campaign at that season had been unknown among the Danes. It was the feast of the Epiphany, or Twelfth Night, and it is probable that Alfred and his followers were celebrating that festival after the custom of the age. At all events they were unprepared; for when Guthrum and his hosts appeared suddenly before the gates of his stronghold, no resistance could be offered: many were slain, but Alfred escaped with a few followers into the fastnesses of the moors. "This year," A.D. 878, the Saxon Chronicle records, "during mid-winter, after Twelfth Night, the army stole away to Chippenham, and overran the land of the West Saxons, and sat down there; and many of the people they drove beyond sea, and of the remainder the greater part they subdued and forced to obey them, except King Alfred." It would appear, however, that this was not done without further contest than that of the treacherous surprise at Chippenham; for, according to other accounts, Alfred immediately after fought several battles in succession, and being unsuccessful, then it was that the men of Wessex gave up the contest in despair, that numbers of them fled to the Isle of Wight and the opposite coasts on the Continent, and the rest submitted to the Danish rule.

It is quite clear that at this period the Danes rode triumphant over Wessex, and that Alfred, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records, retreated to the woods and moors for safety. He was naked and powerless, but he was not alone. He had no thanes around him to support the banner of the white horse, but the brave men of Somersetshire continued in the main true to the cause of their king and country. But even in their territories, where he finally sought refuge, he was obliged to hide in fens or coverts for fear of being betrayed to Guthrum. It was in the Isle of Athelney, or Prince's Island, near the confluence of the rivers Thone and Parret in Somersetshire, a tract of country then covered by a dense wood and tenanted only by wild beasts, that Alfred, and some of the men of Somerset, took refuge. It was a safe retreat, for the island, when not washed by the two rivers, was insulated by bogs and inundations which could only be passed by a boat. It was an outlaw life which Alfred and his followers led; for under the Saxon laws every man was bound to have a settled habitation; and to be a wanderer, whether freeman or slave, was to incur the peril of life. Alfred himself had confirmed the laws of Ina, which set forth that if any one journeying through a wood out of the highway did not either shout or blow a horn, was to be considered a thief, and was either to be slain or redeemed. Alfred and his band did in reality plunder for subsistence, for, issuing from their hiding-place, they made secret forays among the Danes, or the people who lived under them, for the bare necessaries of life.

It is to this period that the story related by his bosom friend, the monk Asser, refers; a story which was repeated by all the writers who lived near this period, and which may therefore be considered authentic. In one of his excursions Alfred took refuge in a cowherd's cottage. He stayed there some time. Probably the cowherd himself knew the quality of his guest, but his wife was ignorant of it. The cowherd might have kept the secret as others did, but it might have been dangerous to have entrusted that secret to his dame. One day, the story goes on to say, Alfred sat by the fire mending his bow; some *loudas*, or loaves of bread, being on the hearth baking. Alfred thought more of his bow than the bread; he was probably meditating as to the manner in which he could best avenge his country's wrongs. But the bread was all the cowherd's wife thought of or cared about. On a sudden, seeing it burn on the hearth, she ran hastily and removed it, at the same time administering this reproof to her careless guest: "You man, you will not turn the bread you see burning, but you will be glad to eat it." Asser adds, "This unlucky woman little thought she was talking to King Alfred."

During his retreat in Athelney, Alfred maintained a correspondence with some of his faithful adherents, and the cowherd might have been one of his messengers. By degrees a few of his thanes and nobles gathered round him, and before Whitsuntide he saw hopes of again being able to contend with the Danes. Legend is very busy with tales of encouragement from supernatural intervention. These form no part of history, but one is a good trait of the times, and affords a touching picture of Alfred's destitution and benevolence. It says:—"One day in his adversity he was visited by St. Cuthbert, who, in the garb of a poor man, asked alms. He was reading a book when the pilgrim entered his covert, and the king lifted up his hands to heaven and said, 'I thank God of his grace that he assisteth this poor man by another poor man, and vouchsafeth to ask of me that which he hath given me.' Alfred had but one loaf, which he divided with the pilgrim, who vanished, but afterwards appeared in a vision, and announced that the days of the king's adversity were over, and that glory and honour awaited him."

Alfred's followers increased daily. The nobles and men of Wiltshire, Hampshire, Somersetshire, and Dorsetshire once more flocked to him and rallied round his standard. An important event favoured his cause. A band of Danes under Hubba, a chief of great renown, in an attempt to land in Devonshire, had been resisted by Earl Oddune and slain with several hundred of his followers; and what was considered to be the most important part of Oddune's victory was, that the magical banner of the enemy, the raven, had fallen into the hands of the Saxons. This was more encouraging to Alfred than any vision of the night



ALFRED THE GREAT IN THE NEATHERD'S COTTAGE.

could have been, even if all the Romish saints in the calendar had appeared therein. After receiving this welcome news, Alfred resolved again to strike for victory.

Before he did this, however, it was necessary for him to know the force and condition of Guthrum's army. But how was this to be known? The story, as it is told, savours of romance, and yet it is believed to be authentic. Alfred puts his life in jeopardy. He becomes a minstrel or gleeman. With his harp he approaches the Danish camp, into which he gained a ready entrance. Though fierce in battle, the Danes loved to listen to the sweet strains of music. Alfred wandered from tent to tent producing dulcet sounds from his instrument, and the fierce warriors were charmed. Even Guthrum himself welcomed and feasted the poor Saxon gleeman, and, well pleased with his reception, he departed. It was such a reception as he desired, for as he wandered through the camp amusing the Danes he noticed their sloth and indolence, ascertained some of their plans, and was thereby enabled on his return to Athelney to give an accurate account of the state and habits of the Danish army. Messengers were sent to all quarters requesting the men of Wessex to meet him in arms at Egbert's stone on the east of Selwood forest, and at the time appointed Alfred saw himself once more at the head of a numerous army: the banner of the white horse was again raised to contend for victory with the bloody raven, and all who rallied round it were resolved to conquer or die.

ALFRED'S JEWEL.

The battle of Ethandune, probably Eddington, near Westbury, which followed, was one of those decisive conflicts which entirely change the position of the two contending parties. Alfred's secret and sudden movement saved the kingdom of the West Saxons. It must not be supposed, however, that the Danes had not heard of this re-gathering of the Saxon forces. It was no night surprise like that which had sent Alfred from his stronghold at Chippenham to his exile in the alderwood isle of Athelney. They came out of their camp in apparently overwhelming numbers, but the Saxons met them in dense array, and after an obstinate struggle Guthrum and his warriors who had escaped the carnage fled to their fortress. Alfred followed them to the edge of their camp with unsparing slaughter. There was no more fighting in the open field. The whole country was roused, and the Danes were beleaguered on every side. For fourteen days the Saxons hovered round their camp, cutting off all supplies, and then Guthrum surrendered at discretion. He offered to give hostages and to quit the kingdom of Wessex, but this time Alfred would not trust to the oaths of the Danes in making peace with them. They had only been made hitherto to be broken. Guthrum himself had on a former occasion not only sworn by the golden bracelet, but by the relics of Saxon saints which Alfred had considered would be more binding, but this double oath had been disregarded, for it had no sooner been taken than he resumed offensive operations. Nothing less, therefore, than the conversion of the Danes to Christianity would now satisfy Alfred. He felt that a change of religion would detach them from their savage brethren across the seas, and he insisted that Guthrum should consent to be baptized. If he and his followers, he said, would become Christians and join with him to prevent the ravages of other Danes, then he would spare their lives and assign to them homes and land in his own territories. At this time the Danish tribes in East Anglia had abjured their pagan faith and embraced Christianity, and there appears to have been no great unwillingness on the part of Guthrum and his followers to follow their example, the great inducement probably being settled homes in our beautiful island. So Guthrum, seven weeks after his submission, was baptized with thirty of his officers, Alfred being his sponsor, and he receiving the name of Athelstan.

There can be no doubt that Alfred, in thus insisting upon Guthrum's conversion to Christianity, was moved with an ardent desire to propagate and extend the Christian faith. He was a devout man, and was surrounded by counsellors selected from the priesthood. In offering such easy terms to Guthrum, also, he acted with the truest wisdom. It would have been in vain for him to have sought the expulsion of all the Danes from England. Those in East Anglia had too secure a possession to be driven out easily. They had become settlers and cultivators of the soil; had adopted the faith and habits of their Saxon neighbours; and hence had entered into the nationality of England. It was evidently Alfred's desire that Guthrum and his warriors should become one with his people likewise. He foresaw that if they settled down to agricultural pursuits, and to habits of industry, that they would not only win the rovers of the north from their old piratical habits, but that they would form a safeguard for the coasts they once had desolated. And there was land enough and to spare for both Saxon and Dane. England had never been thickly populated; and from famine, pestilence, and war, at this period it had been greatly thinned. Then again, in the palmiest days of the

Roman dominion, much fertile land remained uncultivated, and vast tracts which had been tilled had now gone out of cultivation. There can, therefore, be no doubt of the wisdom of Alfred's policy in the endeavour to make the Danes and Saxons one people; especially as they in reality differed in but few essentials. This was clearly the object of "Alfred's and Guthrum's peace." Their compact read thus:—"This is the peace that King Alfred and King Guthrum, and the Witan of all the English nation, and all the people that are in East Anglia have ordained, and with oaths confirmed for themselves and their descendants, as well as for born or unborn, who seek of God's mercy, or of ours. First concerning our land boundaries: up on the Thames, and then up on the sea, and along the sea unto its source, then right to Bedford, then up on the Ouse into Watling Street." Beyond these lines, all on the east side of the island as far as the Humber was surrendered to the Danes. As they had already established themselves in Northumbria, these territories became united; and the whole eastern country from the Tweed to the Thames, where it washes a part of Essex, took the name of the *Danelagh*, or Danelaw, which name it bore down to the period of the Norman Conquest.

But "Alfred's and Guthrum's peace" did not stop here; it not only settled land boundaries, but assimilated the laws of the Danes to those of the Saxons. Manslaying and plunder were especially provided against in this treaty—regulations which were no doubt necessary, but which exhibit a remarkable picture of society. The lives of the Danes and Saxons were to be held equally dear. Thus, if a Saxon slew a Dane, or a Dane slew a Saxon, the penalty for the crime was to be the same in either case. As the Saxon and Danish forces had so often met in fierce hostility it was presumed that outbreaks might occur, and hence by a wise forethought it was ordained that there should be no secret intercourse between them. The soldiers of neither party were to go to the camp of the other without permission. Then again, as regards traffic between the two peoples, hostages were to be given as pledges of peace, and as evidence that those who went to the stranger's camp or frontier went for a lawful purpose. Finally, both Alfred and Guthrum engaged to promote the Christian religion and to punish apostasy. Whether Guthrum's conversion was sincere may be doubted; but it is certain that Alfred's magnanimity secured in him a faithful friend. Having spent twelve days with Alfred after his baptism as a guest,—being, according to Asser, right royally treated,—he departed into East Anglia, where he established himself as a vassal sovereign, and remained true to the compact into which he had entered to the day of his death.

From this period, A.D. 880, Alfred enjoyed repose for several years. The interval of tranquillity with which he was favoured was employed in multifarious labours. As will be seen in a future page, it was at this time that he ardently engaged in literature, studying with such diligence that he took rank with the most learned men of his age. But he was no recluse. He did not neglect his kingdom for literary fame. On the contrary, he rebuilt his shattered cities, and especially London, which had been destroyed in the reign of Ethelwulf; erected castles and fo for the defence of the coasts; and increas number of his shipping. His chief care, inde to provide for the defence of his kingdom. the old arrangement the *fyrd* or army consi the entire military force of the country, whic was bound by law to serve for a certain usually not more than forty days. Such a was impolitic, for when this levy in mass wa many districts were left defenceless, and cult of the land was for the time neglected. To this state of things Alfred made two divisions o liable to military duty, which alternately r each other; one keeping the field to meet any emergency, and the other staying at home purposes of protection and agriculture. The therefore, always a standing army ready to me fresh invaders who should dare to disturb th of the country. As regards his fleet, he not o creased the number of vessels, but improve build after a model of his own invention. H finally consisted of more than a hundred sail, a distributed in squadrons at different ports; an were all provided with warlike engines, and n by expert seamen: Frisians, who with the were the best that navigated the German Oce native English, whom he had instructed in a appertained to nautical affairs. Alfred's at was also turned to the internal affairs and ad tration of his kingdom. He not only rebuilt and erected fortresses and castles, but caused to be repaired, and roads cleared and im The country had become one vast scene of desc but it once more began to exhibit a prosperou flourishing condition. Desolated homesteads w constructed, and fields which had been laid again produced abundant harvests. Nor were all the labours executed during this interval of by this sagacious and able monarch. Durin devastations of the Danes the course of public had been suspended, and the bonds of social destroyed. To remedy this state of things was more formidable work than material reparatio Alfred nevertheless restored the empire of la reconstituted society upon its basis. He no prepared a statute-book which was sanctioned Witan, and promulgated as the law of the lan he was careful that its enactments were duly en and that the judges gave their decisions accord that law. Ignorant judges were removed, and that were found to be corrupt chastised, a appeals from judgments carried to the throne patiently considered. These subjects will fuller illustration in their proper place in this hi we now proceed with the events of this rema monarch's reign—civil and military.

While Alfred was thus nobly employed, his dom was exposed to occasional incursions of D pirates. Thus in the year 882 the great Danish Hastings, who with his hosts had blockaded the and who had concluded a truce with France, sud sailed to the English coasts, where he was de by Alfred's fleet. Two years after they land Rochester; but Alfred, ever vigilant, soon ap among them, and drove them back to their

These were the chief incursions during the interval of fourteen years in which Alfred was employed in study, the establishment of order, the consolidation and protection of his kingdom, and the improvement of his people. He was now thirty-four years of age, and his children—two sons and three daughters—were growing up around him. He was in the height of his prosperity. His eldest son Edward was destined to succeed him, but in 893 he was called upon to exchange his pen for the sword, to preserve it for his successor's inheritance.

Since his defeat at Rochester, Hastings with his Danes had been desolating the continent. They had overrun the countries of the Rhine, the Scheldt, and the Meuse, and had sacked and destroyed many cities which had flourished from the period of the Romans. Similar ravages had been also committed by them in the Netherlands. Flushed with victory, Hastings now led them again to England. Nor was it victory alone that induced the Danish chief once more to try his fortune of war in our island. Its corn-fields, during the repose with which it had been blessed, had borne plentiful harvests, and its pastures were well sprinkled with flocks and herds. During their devastations in the provinces of France, the Danes had reduced their enemies to want, and they could no longer find sustenance for themselves. The prosperity of England, therefore, was a strong temptation to these hungry Northmen; and although they were aware that they had a king to contend with who would battle to the death to protect his kingdom, it was a temptation they could not resist. They came in two bands: one landing in the mouth of the Thames; another on the coasts of Kent. As before seen, Alfred had now a standing army, and great though the danger was, Hastings did not find him unprepared. Alfred was in East Anglia, regulating the affairs of that country, and of Northumberland, when he received the news of this invasion. At that time, Guthrum, his friend and ally, was dead, and before he left those parts he exacted a new oath of allegiance, and a greater number of hostages from the Danes settled in those kingdoms. He then directed his march southward. The Danes, under the command of Hastings, had entrenched themselves near Milton on the Swale: the other band was still on the coasts of Kent. Alfred threw himself between the two armies, encamping about midway between the hostile forces. His entrenchments were rendered so formidable by nature and art, that the Danes dared not attack him, and he watched them so closely that neither party ventured to move for fear they should be cut off. In this posture the three armies remained for some time, and despairing of success in the open field, the Danish chief had recourse to stratagem. He negotiated terms of peace, sent two of his sons to Alfred's camp as hostages, and embarked his followers on board his ships, as if he really intended the abandonment of his enterprise. But the Greeks of old were not more treacherous than were the Danes of this period. Alfred nobly returned his hostages, and ignobly was he repaid for his confidence and generosity. On a sudden, the Danish army which had landed in Kent marched across the country to effect a junction with that which had landed in the Thames, and which was at that moment pretending to set sail from the island. Alfred, however, was on the alert. He overtook the Danes at Farnham in Surrey, and in a general engagement defeated them with great slaughter. Those who escaped fled through Middlesex and Essex, and took refuge in the Isle of Mersey at the mouth of the Colne, where they were blockaded. Inevitable destruction seemed to await them, but the genius of Hastings, and the treachery of the colonists in Danelagh, saved them.

During these events, the Danes of East Anglia and Northumbria, regardless of their oaths and obligations, had revolted. A great armament had been fitted out by the East-Anglian Danes, and had sailed along the coasts and attacked Exeter; while another fleet had coasted round the northern shore and had reached the Bristol Channel. About the same time, Hastings sailed up the Thames, and devastated Mercia. But Alfred was well-nigh ubiquitous; wherever his presence was most needed there he was to be found. He drove the East-Anglian Danes from Exeter, and swept the Danish host out of Mercia. Once more Hastings took refuge in the Isle of Mersey, where during the winter he received powerful reinforcements from beyond the seas and all Danelagh. In the year 895, having first thrown up another formidable entrenchment at South Showbury, the Danes marched across the country and captured Chester. Driven from that city which had been strongly fortified by the Romans, from want of supplies, which Alfred effectually cut off by land and sea, the Danes passed into North Wales, which they ravaged with impunity. On their return from that country they marched in the direction of the Severn and Avon, but meeting with Alfred's forces, they retraced their steps, and marching through Northumbria, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk—nearly the whole length of Daneland—they regained their fortified post at South Showbury, where they wintered. In the next spring, A.D. 876, Hastings sailed to the mouth of the Lea, as far as Ware, and erected a new fort for his protection. The subjects of Alfred were unanimous, from one end of the country to the other, in supporting his cause, and the Londoners were not behindhand in their loyalty. They boldly marched against the Danes, but were defeated with great loss. Alfred, however, came for their defence, and singular as it may read in these days, it is recorded that he encamped round about the city till the citizens had gathered in their harvest. This done, he pushed forward a strong reconnoissance towards the Lea, at that time far deeper and broader than it is at the present day. It was covered with Danish ships, and Hastings was close by with his hosts in their entrenchment. Having surveyed his camp, Alfred conceived a plan by which he hoped to insure their destruction: the course of the Lea below the enemy's position was turned, and the Danish fleet was left aground, useless. Hastings, however, escaped his danger. Under cover of the night he left his entrenchments and traversed the whole of the country which divides the Lea from the Severn, and having reached Bridgenorth in Shropshire unmolested, he threw up an encampment in which he wintered. Meanwhile the Londoners had seized the Danish fleet; and while some of the ships were destroyed, others

were got safely afloat and brought to London in triumph.

The Danish chieftain had now maintained war in the heart of England for full three years. He was now, however, hemmed in on all sides, and being reduced by constant losses, he prepared to leave the country. His non-success had been so great that dissensions had broken out among his leaders, and from the same cause the people of Daneland and his kinsmen on the Continent appear to have become disaffected towards him. Hastily equipping a small fleet on the eastern coast, he crossed over into France, where it would appear that through fear of him the French monarch granted him a settlement on the banks of the Seine. But though Alfred had thus rid himself of this dangerous enemy, with some of his followers, others remained, and still kept up a desultory warfare. On one occasion, being joined by the Welsh, and probably by some of their kinsmen of Daneland, they threw up entrenchments at Boddington in the county of Gloucester, and boldly defied the power of Alfred. But they paid dear for their temerity. Alfred surrounded them with his whole forces, and they were reduced to such extremities that many of them perished with hunger. At length, having eaten all their horses, they made a desperate sally upon the English, and while some cut their way through them, the rest perished. The band was finally broken up, and the small remains of them either dispersed among their kinsmen of Daneland, or under Sigefrit, a Northumbrian, became pirates. The southern shores, indeed, were for several years subject to desultory attacks from these and other freebooters from Scandinavia. But the great general, Alfred, now became the "first English admiral." With ships of greater length of keel, height of board and swiftness and steadiness than those of the Danes and of Sigefrit, he swept the coasts wherever they appeared, and all those he captured were executed as pirates. On one occasion he captured twenty of their ships as they were exercising their ravages in the west, and the whole of their crews were hanged at Winchester.

SAXON SHIP.

This severity, so much at variance with Alfred's humanity, has been held by some writers to be inexcusable; but it must be recollected that the Danish system of piracy had become intolerable throughout Europe, and that while it existed there could be neither peace nor security. Besides, many of the ships captured were manned with the people of Daneland, who had sworn allegiance to him, had received benefits from him, and were bound to protect the states they ravaged. That his severity was well timed, history affords a proof, for, together with the posture of defence which he had everywhere established, he restored full tranquillity to his kingdom. The East-Anglian and Northumbrian Danes made anew their submission to him, and he took them under his own government, no longer allowing them to be under the rule of one of their own race. The Welsh also acknowledged his authority, so that by his valour, prudence, and justice, he had established his sovereignty before he died over all the southern parts of the island, from the English Channel to the frontiers of Scotland.

During the period when Alfred was thus contending against his enemies by land and sea, a great pestilence raged in the country for three whole years, sweeping away numbers of the people, both Saxons and Danes, among the former of whom were many of the thanes and nobles. Alfred, of whom little is recorded after the re-establishment of peace, did not long survive. His manifold labours in the court, the camp, the field, the hall of justice, and the study, had been great; and, according to Asser, they were endured in the midst of almost constant physical suffering. In his early years he had been afflicted by a disease called the ficus, and when, at the age of about twenty, this left him, he was attacked by a more tormenting malady, the character of which baffled all the skill of his "leeches." This malady never left him to the day of his death, and coupled with his manifold cares and labours, it caused his sun to set while it was yet day. He expired on the 28th of October, A.D. 901, in the fifty-third year of his age, and the thirtieth of his reign.

Towards the close of his reign King Alfred thus wrote of himself: "This I can truly say, that so long as I have lived I have striven to live worthily, and after my death to leave my memory to my descendants in good works." This was written in no boastful spirit: no truer epitaph has ever been penned. History does not present a nobler character in its manifold pages than this great Anglo-Saxon monarch, whether he is regarded as a ruler or a man. How fondly his memory was cherished by the Saxon people, history testifies. They never forgot him. His name was made the theme of many a popular song long after the Norman Conquest, and even now, after the lapse of nearly a thousand years, it is deservedly held in honour and grateful remembrance. It is right that he should be honoured and remembered. But for him who could tell what England would have been at this date of time? It was his courage and perseverance that rolled back the barbaric Danes from its shores, or made them one people with the Saxons. But this was only a part of the benefit England has derived from the rule of this great monarch. He it was who first saw clearly that there was a people to be instructed and civilized, and he it was who first commenced that great work, both by example, precept, and well-directed munificence.

The intellectual character of this truly great and good sovereign, his literary attainments and productions, his efforts for the promotion of education among

his people, and his improvements in the laws and government of his country, will be illustrated under the proper sections of this history: a few personal details beyond those already itemed down may be interesting.

It is from the pages of the monk Asser—who was to King Alfred what Boswell was to Johnson, namely, an attached friend and gossiping biographer—that these details may be gleaned. From these pages it may be gathered that he was not always clothed in purple or armour, that the crown was not always on his head nor his sword always unsheathed. As a husband, he was adored by his wife; as a father, loved and revered by his children; as a friend, constant and faithful, and admired by all those who enjoyed his friendship. It was the love and regard his people had for him which bound them to his fortunes in his days of adversity. Asser draws a pleasing picture of him in his leisure hours. He was not a proud man, nor above mingling with the meanest of his subjects, or employing himself in their useful occupations. At one time he might be seen gossiping with artisans about their various callings, and at another making mechanical experiments himself. In domestic life he was cheerful and a wise companion; for, says Asser, he loved to recite old Saxon poems at his social board. He was a devout man. He not only went to church to pray, but he prayed in his closet. It was in his closet that, to use his own words, he poured out his heart to Him "who is the stem and foundation of all blessings." And his were not the prayers of a recluse: eight hours out of the twenty-four were spent in study and devotion, the rest were spent in the active duties of life, and in sleep for the refection of his body. His thirst for knowledge was intense. He not only learned to read Saxon in his youth, as before recorded, but in his maturer years he became proficient in the Latin language, an extraordinary acquirement for a prince of that period. He pursued knowledge under difficulties unknown at the present day. Students of the present day may have their watches or clocks before them to mark the progress of time: may have their cheerful lamps before them, and may sit at their ease in well-aired and comfortable studies. But it was not so with this great Anglo-Saxon monarch. At that period clocks and watches were unknown in England, and he contrived to mark his time by the constant burning of wax torches, which were notched in the stem at regular distances. These torches, or candles, were twelve inches long, and six of them, or seventy-two inches of wax, were consumed in twenty-four hours; and thus, supposing the notches were made at the intervals of one inch, from notch to notch would mark the lapse of twenty minutes. But in Alfred's age a palace was more exposed to the weather than most cottages are at the present day, and his knowledge of how time passed would therefore be frequently disturbed by currents of air blowing upon his torches. To obviate this, according to Asser, he invented a horn lantern. "The king," he says, "having found that white horn could be rendered as transparent as glass, he with that material and wood made a case for his torches, which kept them from wasting or flaring. It is clear from Asser that Alfred was a great economist of time—that he considered every moment precious, and to be accounted for. But besides economizing his own time, Alfred regulated with equal care the attendance of his officers. He

SAXON LANTERN.

also economized and regulated his revenues; one portion being set aside for his civil and military service; a second for public works; and a third for the promotion of religion and education. That he was humane above the spirit of his age is evident, for it is recorded that he made attempts to abolish slavery in his kingdom, in which he was unsuccessful. In his regulations for the promotion of justice, he succeeded better. It is said that he established such an excellent system of police, that towards the end of his reign golden bracelets might have been hung in the public highways and cross-roads, no man daring to touch them for fear of the law.

Mention has been made of Alfred's creation of a navy. That navy was not wholly used in repelling invaders from the coasts of his kingdom. Much of his time and attention was occupied in promoting voyages of discovery. Foreigners who could give information of countries wholly or in part unknown were always welcome guests at his court. Voyagers and travellers were sent out by him to Bulgaria, Sclavonia, Bohemia, and Germany, and all the information collected from voyagers, whether natives or foreigners, was committed to writing in the Anglo-Saxon tongue by his own hand, with the noble design of imparting it to his people. On one occasion, having learned that there were colonies of Christian Syrians on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, he sent Swithelm, bishop of Sherbourn, to India, a voyage at that age surrounded with perils and difficulties. Swithelm, however, performed his journey in safety, and brought back with him presents and gems from Indian princes. This was probably the first time that the people of India had heard of England, that small island in the west, which was destined in after days to become sole mistress of that remote country. In this first voyage to India may be seen the germs of that enterprising spirit which is the characteristic of the Saxon race over whom Alfred once ruled so well and so wisely. It has, indeed, been justly re-

marked that the character of one ruler never more influenced the destinies of his country, than did that of King Alfred.

During the period to which this section is devoted, namely the ninth century, very little is recorded of the ancient Britons. The English were so deeply engaged in defending themselves against the Danes that they had neither time nor opportunity to make war upon them; and the Britons were still so much divided and so frequently engaged in warring with each other, that they could not take advantage of the difficulties by which the English were surrounded. At the commencement of the ninth century the most powerful of its chieftains was Conon Tindaethy, who, in the year 817, was succeeded by his only daughter Esylht, and her husband Mervin Vyrch. It was in their reigns that the English made the only two expeditions into Wales, as before recorded, during this period. Mervin was slain in battle with the Mercians A.D. 841, and was succeeded by Roderic the Great, who was so called because he united North and South Wales by his union in marriage with the heiress of the latter country. On the death of Roderic, A.D. 877, his dominions were divided between his three eldest sons; Anarawd having North Wales, Cadelh, South Wales, and Mervyn the territory called Powis. This division was fatal to the peace of the country, for it gave rise not only to discord between the sons of Roderic the Great, but that discord descended to their posterity, often causing war and bloodshed.

Concerning the Picts and Scots there are clearer records in this than in any former period. Who succeeded Achaius, who died A.D. 819, is uncertain; but it seems probable that it was Dunegal, who, in one of the catalogues of the Scottish kings, is called the son of Achaius, and in the other, the son of Selvach. That prince was succeeded, A.D. 831, by Alpine, who was the son of Eochal or Achaius, and therefore, in all probability, Dunegal's brother. In the reign of this prince there was a fierce war between the Picts and Scots. It was a contest for the Pictish crown. The male line of the Pictish reigning family having become extinct, Alpine laid claim to the crown as the son of Fergusiana, only sister to Hungus, the last king of the Picts. His claim, though well founded as being the nearest heir by the female line, was rejected by the Picts, chiefly, it would appear, from their deep aversion to being governed by a king who ruled over their old enemies, the Scots. One Feredeth was raised to the throne, a nobleman of their own nation, but in no way related to their ancient rulers. At the head of his Scots, Alpine marched into the territories of the Picts, and a great battle was fought in Angus, in which he was the victor. Feredeth was slain. Two sons of Feredeth were successively raised to the throne by the Picts, but both were murdered by them. A nobleman named Brude was now selected as their king by the Picts, and by his courage and valour he revived the hopes and spirits of his subjects. A great battle was fought near Dundee, in which the Scots were defeated with great slaughter, and Alpine being taken prisoner was beheaded. He was succeeded by his son Kenneth A.D. 834, who was for some time unable to prosecute his claim for the Pictish crown, his subjects bei willing again to encounter the victorious Pict the other hand, from violent dissensions in their the Picts were prevented from following up victory. There was a suspension of arms f years; but at the end of that time Kennet enabled to renew the contest. At that time was dead, and his brother Drust had succeede on the Pictish throne. There was still diss among the Picts, but they rallied round thei to meet the invaders of their country. This ti Picts were unsuccessful; the Scots obtained a co victory. All the provinces of their kingdom n the Frith of Forth submitted to Kenneth, who, placed garrisons in the strong places of their co returned into Scotland. He had scarcely ret however, when his garrisons were put to the and once more crossing the Forth, a great batt fought on the north bank of the river Tay, in Kenneth was again victorious. The Pictish arm almost annihilated, and from that time he met no further opposition. In the year 842, Ke united the Pictish kingdom to his own domi thus becoming the first monarch of all Scotland.

Kenneth died A.D. 854, and was succeeded brother Dunvenald, of whom little is known. F says that he was a brave and warlike prince, an he suppressed some insurrections of the Pict cultivated peace with all his neighbours. Dun died A.D. 858, and was succeeded by Constanti eldest son of Kenneth. In his reign, the Dane had made occasional descents on the coast of Sc landed in Fife with a powerful army in two div the river Leven separating their forces. One o divisions was defeated by Constantine, but on p the river to attack the other in their fortified ca was unsuccessful. It would appear that his consisted of Picts and Scots, the number of the preponderating; and that the Picts deserted his and fled: by which treachery he fell into the of the enemy, by whom he was beheaded. H succeeded, A.D. 874, by his brother Eth, who following year was slain in a battle with his co son of Dunenvald, who was a competitor for the That cousin, whom modern Scotch historian Gregory the Great, now ascended the throne of land. Gregory spent the first years of his rei regulating the affairs of his kingdom and in g the affections of his subjects. When fully estab on his throne, he made war upon the Strath-Britons, whom he reduced: he captured the to Berwick, and, it is said, took possession of some the kingdom of Northumbria. At a later peri transported an army from Galloway into Irel aid Donach in a war with some Irish chieftain sought his dethronement. Dublin was captur him, and Donach was established on the throne ancestors. Gregory the Great died A.D. 892, an succeeded by his son Dunvenald, who appears t maintained the integrity of the kingdom, as estab by his predecessors, to the day of his death, happened two years after the death of Alfre Great of England; A.D. 903.

SECTION IV.

Edward the Elder.—Alfred was succeeded on his throne by his son Edward. This was the evident intention of his will. By that will he made an ample provision for all his children, both "on the spear side and the spindle side;" but he expressly provided for the preponderating wealth and power of his eldest son Edward. His accession was consented to unanimously by the *Witenagemote*, or national council, but notwithstanding the throne was not settled to the heirs of Alfred on a sure and lasting basis. A competitor appeared in the person of his cousin Ethelwald, who, as the son of Ethelbald, one of Alfred's elder brothers, claimed the throne on the ground of hereditary right. At Alfred's accession, his claim had been overruled on account of his boyhood, and his consequent inability to defend the kingdom. He was now, however, older than Edward, and he conceived that the crown was his in right of succession. At that period, however, although the succession was limited to one family, it did not follow that kings reigned by the law of primogeniture. Sometimes younger brothers were preferred to the elder, and at others a brother of the last sovereign succeeded, to the exclusion of his children. The succession, indeed, seemed to rest with the Witan, who determined in favour of a particular claimant by considerations of mature age, superior talent, and popularity. The Witan might not always be right in their choice, but whoever they approved of was king. In this case their choice fell on Edward; but Ethelwald thought not only that it was his by right, but he could fill it as well as his cousin, and therefore he resolved to dispute the succession, or rather, it would seem, the election. Both sides armed for war; but as Ethelwald found himself the weaker of the two, he declined risking a battle to settle the dispute, and he fled into Danelagh, where he was hailed as king both by the Saxon and Danish population, the former preferring a war to the rigid rule established by Alfred, and the latter being anxious to humble the family of that monarch who had so deeply humbled them. The result of this dispute was an internal war which caused infinite mischief, and led to future horrors, but in the outset of which Ethelwald was slain. He fell in a great battle in East Anglia, which he had invaded, A.D. 905.

Upon the death of Ethelwald, the Danes concluded a peace with Edward, but it was not of long duration. The princes and yarls of Danelagh, and in many instances the people likewise, who had been peaceable under the rule of the great Alfred, not only aimed at making their country independent, but at conquering the Saxon population. The old spirit of conquest had not died out among them: it had only been repressed. A large army of the warriors of Danelagh advanced to the Severn. Edward did not possess the high qualities of his father Alfred, but he inherited his indomitable vigour, and was equally resolved to consolidate the whole island under one supreme authority. In the year 911 a great victory was gained by him over the Danes. But they were not yet conquered, and it is doubtful what the issue might have been had Edward not been assisted by the sovereign "Lady of Mercia," his sister Ethelfleda. Her husband Ethelred, who had held the rule of Mercia as subking under his father-in-law Alfred, died in 912, and his widow still retained the sovereignty of that kingdom. In that princess the whole spirit of Alfred seemed to survive, and she became her brother Edward's powerful ally. There was perfect accord between them, both being resolved to form the whole island into one united kingdom. To this end they fortified their most important towns, and erected fortresses along the frontiers of their territories. Their forces were enabled to resist the invaders, who came again and again in great force against them. Ethelfleda drove the Danes out of Leicestershire and Derbyshire, and compelled many of their tribes to acknowledge her sway. The heroic "Lady of Mercia" died A.D. 920, and Edward succeeded to her authority. After her death he still carried forward his plan of subjugating the Danes to his dominion. He entered their territories, captured most of their towns, and compelled the rest of the Danelagh that lay north of the Humber to own him as their king. The Danish chiefs became his vassals, and the Strath-Clyde Britons, as well as those of Wales, were reduced to his subjection. This prosperity, however, was not long enjoyed: he died at Farringdon, in Berkshire, A.D. 925.

Athelstane.—Malmesbury records that King Alfred was affectionately attached to Athelstane, the son of Edward, and dedicated him, as it were, to war and dominion, by bestowing on him a purple mantle, a belt studded with gems, and a Saxon sword in a scabbard of gold. Be that as it may, on the death of his father he succeeded to the throne which that great monarch had established, and of whom he proved to be no unworthy successor. It appears that he had been brought up under the roof of his aunt, the "Lady of Mercia," Ethelfleda, who carefully watched over his education, and being gifted with great talents, he grew up distinguished both for his scholastic and military attainments. Before he died, Edward had named him his successor, and his succession receiving the approval of the Witan, he was solemnly crowned at Kingston.

Athelstane, however, did not ascend the throne without opposition. By some historians he has been held to be illegitimate; but this is inconsistent with his grandfather's attachment to him, and with his father's naming him as his successor; by both he was treated with that distinction which is due to a legitimate prince. The dispute about his legitimacy appears to have arisen from the fact that his mother, Egwina, was a lady of ignoble birth: that is, she was not one of the race of Cerdic, nor of any other of the Saxon chiefs who had established the Heptarchy. Had Athelstane been base born, it is not likely that the "Lady of Mercia," the noble Ethelfleda, would have interested herself in his education—an education which was to fit him for the government of the kingdom. However this may be, it is said that a nobleman named Elfred headed a conspiracy to depose him, and to raise another son of Edward to the throne. This plot was discovered, and, according to Malmesbury, Elfred was captured and sent to Rome to defend himself by oath before Pope John, and he adds that at the instant he was sworn he fell down, and died

three days after, an event which was considered an evidence of his guilt. Tradition represents that the death of Athelstane's younger brother Edwin was connected with this conspiracy. Having been seduced into it, tradition states that Edwin was placed in a rotten boat with a single attendant, and driven out to sea without oar or rudder, and that he threw himself overboard in despair; but it would rather appear that his death was accidental; for, says Henry of Huntingdon, "By a stroke of adverse fortune, Athelstane lost his brother Edwin, the Etheling, a young prince of great energy and promise, who was unhappily drowned at sea."

Having established his authority over his English subjects, Athelstane endeavoured to provide for the security of his government by disarming the hostility of the Danes, who had recently caused such confusion in the state. At that time Sithric, prince of the Northumbrian Danes, was the only one of that race who had any independent authority in England, and in order to attach him to his interest Athelstane induced him to renounce Paganism and to embrace Christianity; at the same time giving him his own sister Edgetha in marriage, and yielding to him the sovereignty of the whole country from the Tees to Edinburgh, then apparently the northern extremity of the English territories. That alliance, however, was quickly dissolved: though he had professed to embrace Christianity, Sithric was not converted, and he renounced his wife and his faith at the same time. Athelstane was preparing to revenge the injury when Sithric was murdered, his sons Guthric and Anlaf succeeding to his authority. Burning with vengeance, however, Athelstane marched a large army into Northumbria, and that kingdom was annexed to his dominions. Anlaf fled to Ireland, and Guthric to the court of Constantine, king of Scotland. Menaced by Athelstane, the Scottish king promised to deliver up his guest, but unwilling to violate the laws of hospitality, he gave Guthric warning to escape, and he appears to have soon after joined the piratical bands of his countrymen. According to English historians of that period, Athelstane revenged himself on Constantine by entering Scotland with his army, and ravaging it with impunity; reducing the Scots to such distress that their king was compelled to make submission, and do homage to him for his crown. The Scotch historians of the age deny the fact, and it is certain that within a brief period there was war between the two monarchs, which is inconsistent with the tale of Constantine's submission. If it *is* true, Constantine was a traitor to Athelstane, whose magnanimity in restoring him his kingdom deserved gratitude rather than resentment. The truth appears to be that Constantine dreaded the power of Athelstane; and that from this cause he entered into a confederacy with Anlaf, who had joined the piratical Danes whom he found hovering in the Irish seas, and with some Welsh princes who partook of his dread of the English monarch, in order to check his increasing supremacy. These allies invaded England A.D. 933, and Athelstane collecting his forces met them at Brunsbury in Northumberland. Malmesbury relates a tale of Anlaf, as the two armies encamped against each other, of similar import to that which is related of Alfred's visit to the camp of Guthrum the Dane. entered the camp of Athelstane in the disguise strolling minstrel, and played before the king a chief officers in the royal tent, and having be warded for his entertainment, departed. Malme adds that Anlaf was discovered by a soldier wh formerly served under him, but that from a pri of honour he would not betray his old master. the same time he says that he informed Athelsta his discovery and warned him to remove his ten wisdom of which advice was soon made manifest the king having acted upon it, and a bishop wit retinue having on the same day arrived and occ the same spot with their tent, they were on that night attacked and cut in pieces. This night su is said to have brought on a general engage between the two armies, which continued throu the whole of the next day, and in which there great slaughter on both sides. Victory declare the close of the day, in favour of the English: fi the allied princes and twelve chieftains were slai Constantine and Anlaf fled in dismay from the fi battle. By this victory all England was re under the dominion of Athelstane, and all Wales state of vassalage. The Welsh paid him tribu gold, silver, and beeves, and were bound to send best hounds and hawks to his court.

The battle of Brunsbury, which was long d guished by the name of "the great battle," not extended the authority of Athelstane, and consoli his power, but it raised his reputation among fo potentates. That reputation, indeed, was al great. For some time he had been the leading p tate of his age. As the ruler of a great and ind dent kingdom he obtained an European influ remarkable for a period when international amit almost unknown. Kings from every quarter of E sought his alliance and friendship. The Ge king Otho demanded and obtained his sister Elgi marriage; Hugh the Great, duke of the Franks, for and obtained the hand of another sister n Edgiva; a third sister was united to a prince i neighbourhood of the Alps; and Elgiva, the you and fairest, was married to Louis, prince of Aquit So great was Athelstane's power, and so faithfu friendship, that he became the protector of depose exiled princes. Harold, king of Norway, entruste son Haco to his care and education; and Haco b aid was subsequently restored to the Norwegian th Alan, son of the Duke of Brittany, was welc and educated at his court, when his father was ex by the Normans, and was restored to his father heritance by the English monarch. The most trious exile, however, who sought and obtained r at his court was Louis IV. of France, the s Charles the Simple, who, when driven from his t by Rudolph, an usurper, sought refuge with A stane, and was afterwards protected in his kin by the English king against Hugh the Strong Otho, king of Germany, who had drawn their s against him. Athelstane's faithfulness was neve rupted by homage or by presents; and it was integrity of friendship, combined with his power, induced the princes of Europe to seek his alliance

Athelstane died A.D. 940, and was interred

great pomp at Malmesbury. He has left a reputation behind him inferior only to that of Alfred. His name signifies "gem" or "precious stone," and it is supposed to be referable to his personal beauty. Like his grandfather Alfred he was acquainted with letters. He encouraged the translation of the Bible into the Saxon language, as Alfred had done, and a copy of the Gospels in Latin which he presented to the Cathedral of Canterbury still exists in the British Museum. That he was a popular monarch is certain, and his memory is still cherished in some parts of the country where he bestowed peculiar benefits. Thus at Malmesbury, the people have extensive common rights granted by one of his charters; and what is called his tomb at that place is preserved with care and shown to strangers as the resting-place of their benefactor with lingering fondness.

MALMESBURY ABBEY.

Edmund.—According to the chroniclers, Edmund the brother of Athelstane, was only eighteen years of age when he came to the throne; and they record that in him the family virtue of courage neither knew blemish nor decrease. His accession was marked with disturbance from the restless Danes of Northumbria, who were ever ready to embrace a favourable opportunity of breaking out into rebellion. The Northumbrians recalled Anlaf from Ireland and set him up as their king. He was accompanied by his cousin Reginald, and they were making preparations for war when Edmund marched against them. Following the example of their race, they made their humble submission to Edmund, and as they professed their willingness to become Christians, their submission was accepted. Edmund became their sponsor at their baptism; but he had scarcely left Northumbria, when they renounced both their professions of submission and Christianity and again prepared for war. In the year 944, therefore, Edmund marched a second time into Northumbria and reduced it to obedience. As the Cambrian and Strath-Clyde Britons had been the allies of the Northumbrian Danes in all their revolts, he marched into their country and conquered it; but he gave it to Malcolm, king of Scotland, on condition of his defending the north of England from the insurrections and invasions of the Danes. Malcolm, therefore, held it as a fief under the condition of military service. In his war with the Britons, it is recorded that Edmund was guilty of a crime that had very rarely disgraced the Anglo-Saxon monarchs—that of depriving the two sons of Dunmail, king of Cambria, whom he had taken prisoners, of their eyes. If this deed was perpetrated by him he did not long survive the atrocity. The account of his death, as related by the old chroniclers, is very confused, but it illustrates the disposition which still prevailed to employ physical force in a remarkable manner. It is related that Edmund was celebrating the festival of St. Augustin at Pucklechurch in Gloucestershire, when an outlaw whom he had banished had the bold daring to seat himself among his guests. Edmund discovered the intruder and ordered his removal. The robber resisted, and Edmund, flushed with wine and inflamed with passion, started up from his seat, and seizing the outlaw by the hair of his head, flung him to the ground. At that instant the outlaw drew a dagger and stabbed the king in a vital part and he instantly expired. The assassin was cut to pieces by those who had witnessed the deed. Edmund was buried at Glastonbury, A.D. 946.

Edred.—Edmund left two infant sons, Edwy and Edgar, but he was succeeded on his throne by his brother Edred. As usual, the commencement of a new reign was marked by the revival of the spirit of insurrection in the north. Joined by hordes of pirates from Denmark and Norway, and by petty chieftains from Ireland, the Orkneys, and the Hebrides, the Northumbrian Danes once more tried the fortune of war with the Saxons. Under Eric, one of their own countrymen, their rebellion became formidable. The forces of Edgar, however, entered their country and desolated it with fire and sword, and the Danes of Northumbria were humbled: their country became incorporated with the rest of the kingdom more completely than it had ever been. The royal title was abolished, and the administration of Northumbria was entrusted to an English earl A.D. 952.

After the subjugation of the Northumbrian kingdom, Edred assumed the title of "Sovereign of the fourfold empire of the Anglo-Saxons and the Northumbrians, Pagans, and Britons:" from which it may be inferred that some parts of his dominions were still held under Danish chieftains, who, being unconverted, were looked upon as Pagans. Edred, however, did not long enjoy his "fourfold empire." At the time of his accession he was afflicted with a loathsome disease, which, although he was only twenty-three years old, had induced premature old age. He is represented as being feeble in mind as well as body; which, indeed, appears to have been the case, for during the greater part of his reign he was under the sway of that famous monk, Dunstan, whose name now first appears in the page of history: a monk whose cowl was destined for a period to rule the crown. To him Edred resigned his conscience, treasures, and authority, and it may be that his abject submission to him was in part the cause of his strange contest with his successor on the throne. Edred died in the flower of his youth, A.D. 955.

Edwy.—Edred was succeeded on the throne by his nephew, Edwy, the eldest son of Edmund, his youngest brother Edgar being invested with the title of viceroy to act under him; probably taking the rule of the Mercian kingdom. Edwy, who was surnamed "the fair," from his personal beauty, was crowned at Kingston by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury. On his accession he was only sixteen years of age, and, though he occupied the throne but four fleeting years, the events of his reign are among the most interesting in the pages of English history. At the same time the narrative is complicated, arising from the nature of the warfare in which he was engaged, and the different views taken of the two principal charactors who figure therein—Edwy and Dunstan. It was no longer a war with the Danes or the Britons: it was a contest between church and state. Hence monkish historians represent Edwy, who resisted the encroachments of the church, as a tyrant and voluptuary; a king who outraged the laws of nature in private life and who was violent and arbitrary in his public conduct; while historians who favour the resistance of Edwy, blacken the character of his antagonist Dunstan.

In order to illustrate this contest between the cowl and the crown, it is necessary to give a slight sketch of the career of Dunstan up to the time when Edwy ascended the throne.

Dunstan, or, as he is called by Romanists, St. Dunstan, was born in the year 925. He received his early education in Glastonbury monastery, and was subsequently introduced at the court of Athelstane by his uncle Adhelm, Archbishop of Canterbury. His acquirements were far above those of his age, and his musical skill and accomplishments rendered him a favourite at Athelstane's court. Why he left that court is uncertain. One account says, that as he made pretensions to supernatural communications, he lost Athelstane's favour, the magical art being considered by that monarch as the greatest of crimes. Another account says that Dunstan left it of his own accord, having become disgusted with court life. Be that as it may, he returned to Glastonbury, and having in early youth received the tonsure, built for himself a cell, or hermitage, with an oratory. In the monkish sense of renunciation, he had now renounced the world; but he was bent upon subduing that world far more completely by the cowl than by the sword. The cell or cave in which he had ensconced himself was so small that he could not stand upright in it, so humble did he wish to appear to all around. In this cell he spent his time, partly in devotional austerities, and partly in making crosses, censers, vestments, and other articles for the service of the church. His self-inflictions were so severe that his groans are said to have broken the midnight silence, and to have given rise to a rumour that he was contending with the evil one. He was soon surrounded with votaries. Crowds came to gaze upon him as he emerged from his cell to perform the services of the altar. Some suppose that he became deranged at Glastonbury. There is no proof of this: there was deep design in all that he did rather than symptoms of insanity. He indulged in chimeras only to serve the ends at which he aimed. Those chimeras being announced to the multitude established for him all that he desired—an universal character for sanctity. Thus he is said to have fancied that the devil, who was reported to have visited him, was one day more earnest than usual in his temptations, till, provoked by his importunity, Dunstan seized him by the nose with a red-hot pair of pincers, heated at his forge—which he used for making ornaments for the church—as he put his head into the cell, and there held him till the malignant spirit roused the whole neighbourhood with his infernal howlings. Before the people could arrive at the spot, Dunstan let his satanic majesty free. It was by the promulgation of such idle chimeras that Dunstan established for himself a reputation for sanctity. His fame spread far and wide among the people; all, from the highest to the lowest, regarding him as the most remarkable man of his age. In the reign of Edmund, Dunstan had become abbot of Glastonbury, a proud step over the heads of his brethren; but it is said that this exploit of holding Satan by the nose with red-hot pincers was so extolled by the credulous people, that it was the means of his being recalled to court by Edred. It is certain that Edred reposed great confidence in the monk Dunstan. In the early part of his reign, Turketal, who was a grandson of Alfred, and who had rendered great service to all his successors, both on the field of battle and in the national councils, retired from the public service; and having restored the abbey of Croyland, which had been destroyed in the irruptions of the Danes, became its abbot and spent the remainder of his days in monastic occupations. On his retirement, Dunstan became the chief director of the public affairs of the country. He was keeper of Edred's treasures if not the director of his wars. He was his chosen counsellor, and the virtual prime minister of his kingdom. According to one of his biographers, he was more—he was *rex et regis imperator*, "king and ruler of the king." He is said to have refused the see of Winchester offered him by Edred; but his domination was probably better secured by his position as abbot of Glastonbury. He was planning a real revolution—the establishment of the monastic rule in England, and the supremacy of the papal power over its throne. Such was the man with whom the fair and youthful Edwy had to contend.

During his power in the reign of Edred, this proud churchman had introduced the Benedictine order of monks into England. At this period, monachism had fallen into disrepute, but he resolved to revive it in all its integrity. The canons of the Anglo-Saxon church did not, indeed, recognize a married priesthood, but the law of celibacy had never been strictly enforced in England. Among the parochial clergy marriages were very common, the law of nature being stronger than the decrees of councils. Monastic establishments were numerous; but the monks were not subjected to the strict rules of their ascetic founder, St. Benedict. In the eyes of Dunstan this was an abuse, and he set himself about its reformation. His first step was to introduce the rigid monastic rules into the monasteries of Abingdon and Glastonbury. This reform, however, was not generally approved of, either by the clergy or the people. A

violent commotion ensued, and Dunstan, by taking this step, created for himself many enemies: enemies who keenly watched events to secure his downfall.

Such was the state of affairs at the accession of Edwy. When he ascended the throne, Dunstan was anxious to secure the same ascendancy over him as he had exercised over Edred. But this was no easy task to accomplish, for, unlike his uncle, Edwy had a will of his own. He was not inclined to be ruled by a monk. It would appear, indeed, that he was averse to the Benedictine rules which Dunstan had introduced into the church; and that at least he had betrayed some leaning towards the married clergy, who, by those rules, were called upon to put away their wives under pain of excommunication. This was sufficient to incur the resentment of Dunstan and his Benedictine partisans. It was clear to them that if Edwy was not overawed while yet he was young, he would never become an instrument in their hands, but would, on the contrary, encompass their ruin. An attempt to subject him to their will was therefore made, and that in a manner which savours both of insane violence and priestly intolerance.

Shortly after his accession, Edwy contracted a passion for the fair Elgiva, who is represented to have been his first or second cousin, and therefore related to her in a degree, which, without the express dispensation of the pope, would have rendered the marriage illegal. But this relationship does not appear clear. It is related that on that account the union was opposed by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, and especially by Dunstan; and yet we find that when Edwy was married to Elgiva, the Bishop of Bath and Wells and three other bishops were subscribing witnesses to the union. If their relationship, therefore, had been within the prohibited degrees of affinity, it can scarcely be supposed that any bishop would have been present at the ceremony. Then, again, it is represented that Elgiva and her mother Ethelgiva, who was a lady of noble if not of royal descent, were depraved characters; and yet we find that after their marriage, both Otho and Dunstan were among those who frequented the court of Edwy. If the marriage had been illegal, and Elgiva and her mother were disreputable characters, it is strange, indeed, that orthodox churchmen should have sanctioned the union and have been willing guests at Edwy's festive board. But even if there had been some slight infringement of church law in the union, it was not sufficient to justify the conduct of Dunstan and his party in the course they pursued, to set it aside and to subdue Edwy to their will. That course was both brutal and insolent.

Edwy's coronation was deferred for a time, and when it took place it was followed by a banquet. Around him sat his nobles, and the clergy were not backward in coming to the feast. Odo was there, and so was St. Dunstan. All went on for a time merrily; the bishops and nobles quaffed their wine, as was the custom of the age, deeply. It is possible that as Edwy was young, he could not drink so deeply as his guests, and that he was even disgusted with their excesses. At all events, while they were revelling, he retired from the banqueting hall and sought the society of his wife and mother in an inner apartment. His absence was remarked by Odo and Dunstan; and the latter, with another of the guests, rushed from the hall, and, entering the king's apartment, seized him forcibly, and dragged him back to the banquet. This was a humiliation that the proud spirit of Edwy could not brook: he was resolved on revenge, especially as Dunstan, when he entered into the presence of Elgiva, addressed her and her mother in the most brutal and threatening language. By his bold daring, Dunstan no doubt thought he should be able to prop up his tottering authority, but Edwy was no coward king. He was determined to scourge this daring monk. As before seen, he had been Edred's treasurer, and it had long been suspected that he was guilty of peculation in his office. Accordingly he was now openly accused of that crime, and his property was sequestered and all his court offices taken from him: finally he was banished the kingdom. Edwy's revenge was even extended to his order: the Benedictine monks were expelled from their several monasteries, and they were handed over to their original owners, the secular clergy.

It was thus that Edwy revenged himself on Dunstan: thus that he vindicated the honour of his queen. But though Dunstan was banished, Odo, who was a Dane by birth, and a harsh, ambitious man, was still Archbishop of Canterbury, and at the head of a powerful party in the state, who were able to contend with their king. A plot was concocted to separate him from his fair Elgiva, on the plea that their marriage was unlawful; not by a solemn act of separation pronounced by ecclesiastical authority, but by villany and the sword. Armed retainers of that proud churchman obtained possession of his much-loved queen, and after branding her fair face with hot searing-irons to destroy her beauty, sent her into Ireland. That Edwy might not take vengeance on him and his party for this foul act, Odo became the instigator of rebellion. Foul calumnies were everywhere spread abroad, and there was a general rising in that old settlement of the Danes, Northumbria. Edgar, the brother of Edwy, was set up, not as a subruler but as a king, and he became an independent sovereign in the country north of the Thames. Nor was this all the misery and humiliation Edwy was called upon to endure at the hands of the proud churchmen. His hapless queen having recovered from the cruel infliction she had suffered, returned to rejoin him, but she again fell into the hands of her enemies, and was put to death. It was at Gloucester that she was intercepted and murdered: and at that place also, after a short reign of four years, Edwy died, either by the hand of violence or of a broken heart. It is from this period that monastic chroniclers date the triumph of the Benedictine order in England, a proof that its establishment was the leading cause of this unhappy contest between Edwy and the orthodox clergy. Had he not sided with the secular order of the clergy, it is evident that nothing would have been heard of the illegality of his marriage with Elgiva. He was persecuted and shorn of power by the insolence of the monks, who excited a superstitious people against him in order to extend the power and authority of the church.

Edgar.—Edgar was only thirteen years of age when

the land was divided between him and his brother Edwy; and he was still a mere boy when he assumed the full sovereignty in England. Dunstan had returned in triumph immediately after the rebellion, and under this boy king he became the head of the kingdom. There was now peace in the land, for Edgar submitted to the will of the dominant ecclesiastical authorities, and hence there were no political nor personal foes to disturb his tranquillity. It was solemnly promulgated that at the birth of Edgar, Dunstan heard an angelic voice saying that so long as Edgar should reign, and he himself survive, there would be peace in England. Dunstan ruled and there *was* peace: the wily monk became indisputable governor of the country. Honours fell thick and fast upon him. He first became Bishop of Winchester, then of London and Worcester; and finally, on the death of Odo, he was made, or rather he made himself, Archbishop of Canterbury. It was said that when Odo, the fierce primate, consecrated him Bishop of Worcester, he named him his successor in the Archbishopric of Canterbury, averring that he so spoke under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost.

During the reign of Edgar the ambitious Dunstan and his party used their power in establishing their cause. The celibacy of the clergy was enforced; and those who were married, if they did not put away their wives, were expelled from abbeys, monasteries, cathedrals, churches, and chantries. There appears, however, to have been a few exceptions. As some of the canons of cathedrals were members of noble houses, and allied by marriages with the highest families in the realm, it would have been dangerous to have meddled with them, and therefore as a matter of policy they were allowed to keep both their wives and their church dignities. It is certain, however, that the great majority of married priests were deprived of their offices, and that those by whom they were succeeded were doomed to celibacy.

In order to extend monachism, Dunstan urged Edgar to establish new foundations subject to Benedictine rules, and this was effected with such zeal, that during his reign nearly fifty houses of monks and nuns were established, the greater part being among the Danish population by whom Edgar had been raised to the throne. They being his partisans looked upon these ecclesiastical changes with less suspicion than the Saxons, and their Christianity was of such a modern date, and sat so loosely upon them, that they were as ready to receive a clergy of monks as a clergy of seculars. But it was not so with the Saxon population. They had at this period of history become accustomed to a clergy who had been their spiritual advisers and friends—who had not only preached to them in their own language in their pulpits, but who had visited them from house to house, and had prayed with them in the hour of affliction and death. It must be conceded that in that age the light of Christianity did not shine in all its fulness, but at the same time it cannot be denied that as a body the Saxon clergy were men of virtue and piety. But for them the whole fabric of Anglo-Saxon society would, during the recent contests with the Danes, have relapsed into primitive barbarism. And yet these were the men that Dunstan came to root out! And who were the priests that were put in their places? Not priests to mingle with the people, but a body of ascetics and learned men who stood aloof from them—men who handed the torch of knowledge from one to another as they ran their course, but who left the people to wallow in ignorance. They were historians and transcribers, architects and painters; but they were not pastors. They were skilled in the accomplishments of the cloisters, but they could not preach; and if they did, it was in an unknown tongue. They were men who had no country but the church; who had no veneration but for St. Dunstan and the sovereign pontiff—men who ate the flesh and fat of the realm, leaving only the bones for the famished people. Such was the issue and effect of this first great battle for a dominant ecclesiastical power in England.

BENEDICTINE MONK.

But while Dunstan and his party were engaged in the ruin of the Saxon secular clergy it cannot be denied that the kingdom was governed with success. There was peace in all its borders. It is said that the "fierce caldorman hung up his armour" in every part, and that the fleet which Alfred had created was so greatly increased, and the ships so well disposed, and kept so constantly in motion, that the "sea kings" no longer ventured to ravage the coasts. At the advice of Dunstan every part of his dominions was visited by Edgar annually; and in these land progresses he was either attended by the primate himself, or by ministers of his appointing. As he went from county to county, audiences and feasts were given, appeals heard, and acquaintances made by Edgar among all the leading men in England, both Danes and Saxons. Sometimes it would appear the princes of Wales, Cumbria, and Scotland met him in these progresses to do him homage. Thus on one occasion it is recorded when he held his court at Chester, eight kings rowed him up the river Dee to the monastery of St. John, Edgar himself guiding the

helm. This may not be authentic, but it is certain he assumed prouder titles than any of his predecessors; for he was styled Basileus, or Emperor of Albion, King of the English, and of all the surrounding nations. It is equally certain that neighbouring kings paid him tribute. As for the pomp displayed by him, the monkish chroniclers never seem to have been weary of referring to it. Kings, they say, trembled before him, and especially Kenneth of Scotland. He was of diminutive stature, and Kenneth, while a guest at his court, having made some offensive remarks as to the power which had been established by such "a sorry little fellow," Edgar invited him to a conference in a wood, where he proposed a duel, whereupon, say the chroniclers, the sturdy Scot fell at his feet and tendered his submission.

The stories of the monkish chroniclers relating to Edgar's pomp and power seem rather to belong to an age of monarchical despotism than to that of a limited Saxon king. He is recorded by them to have been reared up in God's honour; to have loved God's law; to have preserved the people's peace; and to have been the best of all the kings within the memory of man. And yet these same chroniclers relate in their flattering records that the court of this godly and virtuous prince, this renowned promoter of priestly celibacy, at all times swarmed with concubines, some of whom were obtained in the most shameful manner; and that on one occasion he was guilty of a most foul murder in order to gratify his passions. It is, indeed, curious that his panegyrists should have recorded actions committed by their idol which prove that of all the Saxon kings who had reigned before him he was the most vicious and profligate.

It is related by these chroniclers that while yet Edgar had a wife living, and in an early part of his reign, he carried off a young lady of noble birth; named Wulfreda, from the monastery of Wilton, where she was either already a professed nun, or was receiving her education under the veil. Did Dunstan, the great patron of chastity, sanction his royal master's profligacy? Here was the cloister violated, and what did Dunstan do? Did he hunt him from his throne as Edwy had been hunted because he cleaved to a loving and beautiful wife as his heart's best treasure? Alas, no! All the punishment awarded to the royal voluptuary was that he was forbidden to wear that gilded bauble, the crown, on his head for seven years, and to do penance by fasting, which was probably done by deputy. This was not the measure meted out to that faithful husband of one wife, Edwy; and the leniency is the more glaring as it would appear that Edgar was still allowed to retain Wulfreda as his mistress.

The story of Elfrida, related by these same chroniclers, is still more horrible. The king, now a widower, heard of the great beauty of Elfrida, daughter of Ordgar, Earl of Devonshire. In order to ascertain whether her famed charms were not exaggerated, he despatched a courtier named Athelwold to her father's castle to see and report thereon. Athelwold saw the lady and loved her himself: being rich, he wooed and won her in marriage. On his return, he kept his union secret, and disparaged the charms of his bride. Edgar, however, either suspected or was told the truth. The royal voluptuary was not to be baulked in his desires by a courtier. He resolved to pay Elfrida a visit and judge for himself. Athelwold obtained permission to precede him, and on his arrival at Ordgar's castle he besought his wife to forgive him for supplanting a king, and begged her to disguise her beauty by homely attire and rustic demeanour. But Elfrida did not grant her husband's prayer. She was ambitious and revengeful. She decked herself out with the gayest adornment, and when Edgar arrived he was received by her with the most engaging smiles. Edgar was captivated, and the guilty pair soon came to an understanding. Athelwold was run through with a javelin by Edgar's own hand while hunting in the woods, and Elfrida became the royal murderer's wife, Dunstan probably, as primate, performing the ceremony at their marriage.

KING EDGAR, SAXON LADY AND PAGE.

It is a remarkable circumstance that Edgar had been king fourteen years before he was consecrated. The chroniclers make no reference to the cause of this delay in the coronation. They relate that he was forbidden to wear the crown for seven years for the abduction of Wulfreda, but this does not account for the suspension of fourteen years of that ceremony which was held essential in the recognition of a Saxon monarch. At length, however, in the year 973, the ceremony was performed at Bath with great pomp; and two years after, this prince, so great, according to

his monkish biographers, in his public, but so exceptionable in his private character, died at the age of thirty-three years, leaving two sons, Edward and Ethelred, who successively mounted the throne of England. Edgar was buried in the magnificent abbey of Glastonbury.

Edward.—On the death of Edgar a struggle for the succession ensued. Edward, his eldest son by his first wife Ethelfleda, was thirteen, and Ethelred, the son of his second wife Elfrida, was six years of age. Elfrida was naturally in favour of her own son's succession. Although Edward had been named king in his father's will, she boldly maintained that he was excluded by the illegitimacy of his birth. This challenge was unfounded: there can be no question that Edward was born in wedlock. Voluptuary as he had been, Edgar was lawfully married to Ethelfleda, and more righteously than he had been to Elfrida. The question, however, to be decided, was not between these youthful competitors for the crown, but between a secular and a monastic church; for scarcely had Edgar's bones been laid in the abbey of Glastonbury, than the struggle between these two parties in the state was renewed. Dunstan had to fight his battle for the supremacy of the monastic order over again. The secular clergy had been ejected, but they were not destroyed. They now reappeared in various parts of the kingdom, and reclaimed the livings of which they had been so unjustly dispossessed. Both parties had their supporters among the nobles, Alfere, the earldorman of Mercia, declaring for the secular, and Alwyn, of East Anglia, for the monastic order. Elfrida sided with Alfere and the secular clergy, but Dunstan had got possession of Edward, and he was presented by him to the assembled thanes and ecclesiastics at Winchester and consecrated on the spot. The monastic order again triumphed.

Dunstan was not scrupulous in the means used to obtain a triumph. At a synod held at Winchester an appeal was made to him in favour of the secular clergy, but a voice which appeared to come from a crucifix in the wall forbade any such proceeding. While the sound appeared to proceed from the crucifix, Dunstan is said to have sat silent, with his head bent downwards: was he a ventriloquist? This farce was followed by a tragical occurrence. A council was held at Calne, in Wiltshire, to debate the points which divided the church, and threatened the kingdom with civil war. The crucifix at Winchester had determined the controversy in favour of the monks, but the secular clergy were not satisfied with the decision of that oracle. They had been startled by it, but not convinced: most likely they were sceptical as to the genuineness of the miracle: so there was another council held at Calne. As the story is told, this council was held in an upper chamber. Boernholm, a Scottish or Irish bishop, took the lead on the part of the secular clergy, as he had done at Winchester; and Dunstan, as usual, appeared for the monastic order. But he would now no longer, he said, contend with his adversaries. When the crucifix had spoken he had asked Boerholm "what more he wished?" he would now, he said, commit the cause of the church to Christ. As he spoke the floor of the room gave way, but its strength was so miraculously proportioned as to involve the destruction of some of his opponents, while Dunstan and his party escaped. If this story is true, it may be suspected that there was foul play. Malmesbury says that the miracle "secured the archbishop peace on the score of the canons," but the catastrophe may be suspected to have arisen from a previous arrangement of the structure.

The animosities, however, of the two great parties which now divided the kingdom were not to be reconciled by the decision of national or church councils, or by disputations or pretended miracles. Elfrida took the matter into her own hands. She was at the head of a powerful confederacy of nobles who were resolved that her son should reign, and Dunstan be deprived of that power which he had so long enjoyed. Probably even in that dark age, when men were prone to superstition, they saw that his power was working for evil, and hence their resolution to destroy it. Both sides prepared for the contest. Civil war was impending, when an opportunity was afforded to Elfrida, by one foul act, to stop the din of arms, and place her son on the coveted throne. About three years after his accession, the unsuspecting innocence of her stepson Edward put it in her power to execute a design which she had probably long contemplated. As he was one day hunting near Corfe Castle in Devonshire, where she resided, he rode up to it without any attendants to pay her a passing visit. Elfrida came forth with his half-brother Ethelred, between whom there appears to have been a mutual attachment, to meet him at the gate. There were loving greetings between them. Elfrida bade him welcome, and invited him to dismount, but fearing he should miss his company he declined the invitation. He craved, however, a cup of wine, that he might drink to her and his brother Ethelred. That cup of wine was brought forth gladly: but meanwhile Elfrida had made arrangements for her long-wished-for revenge and ambitious designs. As he was lifting the winecup to his lips, one of her attendants stabbed him in the back, and finding himself wounded Edward put spurs to his horse and rode away. The wound might not have been fatal, but, fainting from the loss of blood, he fell from the saddle, and was dragged by one foot in the stirrup, and when he was found by his companions he was a mangled corpse. From the manner of his death, which occurred A.D. 979, this young monarch is known in history by the name of "Edward the Martyr," and certainly the Romish church has canonized many a less innocent saint than this unfortunate prince.

During the reigns of the English kings to which this section is devoted the history of the Britons in Wales is obscure and barren in incident. At the beginning of the tenth century they were still ruled by petty princes, whose rule was marked by strife and confusion. It was during this period that the princes of Wales became tributary to the English, for, according to the Welsh annals, Howel Dha, or "the Good," who began his reign in the year 939, and who united all Wales under his sway, received his kingdom from the hand of "the King of London" on condition of paying a fine of sixty-three pounds of silver, and a certain number of dogs, hawks, and horses annually. Howel Dha was famed for wisdom and justice, and for his abilities as a legislator, and his rule appears to have been a bright spot in the page of Welsh history. At his

death, which occurred A.D. 948, the government again became disunited, and renewed civil war was the result, during which the country was frequently plundered by the piratical Danes, and often invaded by the English; so that notwithstanding the native valour of these descendants of the ancient Britons, they were, from their internal discord, a prey to their enemies by sea and land.

The history of Scotland in the tenth century, though still obscure, becomes more intelligible than at any former period. Constantine, the grandson of Kenneth, the conqueror of the Picts, who commenced his reign A.D. 903, was the contemporary of the two great kings of England—Edward the Elder and Athelstane. With both these monarchs he was at war, but under what circumstances is uncertain, as the annalists of the two countries differ widely in their records. Equally uncertain, also, is the manner of his death; for while some historians affirm that he fell in the great battle of Brunanburgh before recorded, others affirm that he escaped and soon after resigned his crown and retired into the monastery of the Culdees at St. Andrews, where he died. Upon his death or resignation, a son of Dunevald, called by historians Malcolm I., became king of Scotland, which king, as before seen, entered into an alliance with the Saxon mouarch Edmund, receiving Cumbria from him on condition of aiding him against the Danes, their common enemies. In the reign of Edred it would appear that with his consent Malcolm gave Cumberland to Indulf, his presumptive successor, from which time it became a kind of appanage to the apparent heirs of the Scottish monarchs. Malcolm was killed by a band of robbers A.D. 952, and was succeeded by Indulf, who bestowed his principality of Cumberland on Duff, the son of Malcolm. Indulf maintained strict friendship with the English, and for the aid which he afforded against the Danes, one of his contemporaries—either Edred, Edwy, or Edgar—he obtained the cession of the castle and town of Edinburgh, and of all the country between the Tweed and the Forth. Enraged at the perfect accord between the kings of England and Scotland, and probably considering the country of the latter the most vulnerable, the Danes made irruptions on the Scottish coasts; but landing in the country of Boyn they met with a signal overthrow. Indulf, however, was killed in the pursuit of them, and Duff, prince of Cumberland, then, A.D. 961, became king of Scotland, ceding his principality to Culen, son of Indulf. At this period Scotland appears to have been infested with bands of robbers, for it is recorded that in his endeavours to suppress them Duff was slain near Forres A.D. 965. Culen, who succeeded to the throne at the death of Duff, is represented by historians as a profligate prince, who was murdered for a crime of which he had been guilty by one of the Scottish thanes in the year 970, after which Kenneth II., brother of the late King Duff, came to the throne. Kenneth reigned till the year 994, when he was cut off by a conspiracy, but under what circumstances is not recorded. His administration is said to have been wise and vigorous, and he is represented as having, in a great battle near Loncazty in Perth, defeated the Danes who had invaded Scotland; and as having obtained a formal cession of all the country north of the Tweed inhabited by the English, on condition that he allowed the people of that country to retain the laws of England in their community and to speak the English language. No mention, however, is made of this latter circumstance in the Anglo-Saxon chronicles, and the truth of the story may therefore be doubted.

SECTION V.

Ethelred.—At the death of Edward the Martyr Ethelred, the only surviving prince of the race of Alfred, came to the throne. Malmesbury says that he concurred in the murder of his half-brother, but this does not appear to have been correct. On the contrary, it is related that he dearly loved him, and that he wept bitter tears at his death, for which he was chastised by his mother Elfrida. It can scarcely be supposed that a boy of ten years of age could have been a participator in so foul a crime, but although innocent he was destined to partake in the punishment of the guilt. The public mind recoiled from him as the offspring of a most guilty parent. It is recorded that Edgitha, the natural daughter of Edgar by Wulfreda, whom he had stolen from the nunnery at Wilton, was invited to ascend the throne, but that she being herself a nun in the same monastery refused the proffered honour. There was therefore no help for it: Dunstan, as primate, was compelled to place the crown upon the head of Ethelred. He is said to have accompanied the act with this bitter curse: "Even as by the death of thy brother thou didst aspire to the kingdom, hear the decree of Heaven. The sin of thy wretched mother, and of her accomplices, shall rest upon thy head; and such evils shall fall upon the English as they have never yet suffered, from the days when they first came into the isle of Britain, even until the present time."

Dunstan was no prophet, although, from the evils which *did* come upon England during the reign of Ethelred, his denunciation has been assumed to be prophetical. He knew that he had sown seeds which would produce an abundant crop of evils in the land, especially as they were well watered by the fiery zeal of his adherents. It required no prophetic eye to foresee that there would be renewed wars, domestic treasons, and great social profligacy. His very words, as Sir F. Palgrave observes, were calculated in that age to produce the fulfilment of his denunciation—to call up the calamities and miseries which ensued, and which paved the way for the subjugation of England by the Normans. It seems evident, indeed, that Dunstan was desirous of bringing about the evils he had predicted. His power was gone, and he was naturally embittered by the reflection. He could no longer drag a king to the banqueting hall—no longer keep monarchs and people in awe. He had "flourished in the reign of seven kings," but the world was grown tired of his haughty power. He lived till the tenth year of the reign of Ethelred, but there are no records to show that he was esteemed in his old age. He felt this neglect, and hence, if ever he had been, he was now no longer a patriot. He had once upheld church and state, his desire now was to uphold the church and to secure the downfall of the state. All his predictions were uttered for the aggrandisement of the church and not for the peace of the realm. He still retained

his archbishopric, but he appears to have been hostile to the government of Ethelred to the day of his death. There was a quarrel between the king and the Bishop of Rochester, in which Ethelred asserted a demand by military force, and Dunstan threatened him with the vengeance of St. Andrew, but the threat was despised and the demand enforced. Then another prediction was uttered in all the bitterness of a mortified spirit:—"The evils which God has pronounced will shortly come upon you; but they will not come in my days, for this, also, hath God spoken."

But the evils of which Dunstan had forewarned Ethelred *did* commence in his days, and it is by no means certain that the hostile attitude he had assumed towards the government was not a leading cause in bringing them about. The Danes were an ever watchful enemy, and it may be presumed that they knew all about the events which had recently transpired in England, and that they deemed this season of internal discord a favourable opportunity of renewing their incursions. At all events the Danes, in the year 980, again approached the shores of England. Under Sweyn, the banished King of Denmark, Southampton was ravaged and most part of the townsmen slain and led captive. In the same year, also, the Isle of Thanet was ravaged, and in the next, A.D. 981, there was, as the Saxon Chronicle relates, havoc everywhere by the sea-coast, "as well amongst the men of Devon as amongst the Welsh." In the next year, A.D. 982, three ships of piratical Danes landed in Dorsetshire, and in the same year London was burnt. Dunstan was still living when these piratical incursions were made, and yet he took no part in repelling them: did he not by his vengeful predictions rather encourage them? And where was the mighty fleet which Edgar is said by his panegyrists to have possessed? It seems only to have existed on paper, for no mention is made of it in the days of Ethelred. There appears, indeed, to have been neither the means, as far as ships were concerned, nor the principle of resistance in the country. Instead of arming for the defence of their hearths and homes, the people were everywhere quarrelling about the possession of monasteries. The kingdom was beset by foes from within and without, and those from within were chiefly of Dunstan's own creation. There was a conspiracy against Ethelred in Mercia. Alfric the ealdorman—son of Alfere who had espoused the cause of the secular clergy—took the lead in this conspiracy, and was, on its failure, banished; but he was soon restored to his former honours, for the government of Ethelred was too weak either to restrain or punish its enemies, whether native or foreign.

Hitherto the renewed irruptions of the Danes under the ominous standard of the Raven had been only predatory. Soon after the death of Dunstan their incursions became more systematic. Success had made them bold. In the year 991 the Danes landed in East Anglia, and here, for the first and last time, they met with a stern resistance, and that among men of their own race. They were met near Maldon by the ealdorman Brithnoth, and a fierce battle was fought, but Brithnoth was vanquished and slain. And now commenced a system which emboldened the Danes to come again and again to the shores of England. They had ravaged Ipswich, and to get rid of them, on the advice of Archbishop Sidric, it was decreed that tribute should be given them: ten thousand pounds of silver was given them to depart, and they went, but only to reappear in greater numbers.

This cowardly policy was productive of consequences which might have been foreseen. In the next year, A.D. 992, another fleet of Danes appeared off the English coasts in the hope of obtaining further tribute-money. On this occasion a show of resistance was made, but treachery rendered it abortive. A fleet of ships was collected at London in order to block up the Danish fleet in some harbour; but Alfric of Mercia not only warned the Danes of their danger, but being chief commander of the English fleet, went over to the enemy on the eve of a battle, with many of his ships, and thus prevented their probable destruction. It was, indeed, vain to seek to stem the tide of Danish incursions which had now fairly set in. There were treachery and rivalry in the court and in the camp, and if any plan was resolved on which might have averted the danger, it was sure to be made known to the common enemy. All was rotten in the state. There was public corruption, and deep-seated enmity everywhere. Moreover, the army was undisciplined, and Malmesbury records that if the commanders ever met to confer, they rarely or never united in one good plan; for they gave more attention to private quarrels than to the public exigencies.

It was under such circumstances that the Danes infested the land. In the year 993 they came under the command of two kings—Sweyn, King of Denmark, and Olave, King of Norway. That year they sailed up the Humber and plundered Lindsay, after which they marched into Northumbria, where, if they were not welcomed by their own race, they were not successfully resisted. They wintered in that country, and in the spring of A.D. 994 they embarked in their ships, sailed up the river Thames, and invested London. The Londoners drove them back, but they wasted the country around, and sixteen thousand pounds of silver were given them to depart the kingdom. They set sail in the spring of A.D. 995, and for two years there was a calm. At the end of that time, however, fresh armies appeared and devastated the



ROCHESTER CASTLE.

south-west of England. For two whole years they carried on the work of destruction in those parts, and there was but feeble resistance made to their ravages. In the year 999 they sailed up the Thames and Medway, and having defeated the Kentish men near Rochester, they ravaged the country around. Ethelred collected a fleet and an army to resist them, but he did not venture on a battle. Peace was again purchased by a bribe: twenty-four thousand pounds of silver were this time given them, and they sailed to their northern homes.

PASSAGE GALLERY, ROCHESTER CASTLE.

In order to gain the friendship of a nation from whom he and his people had suffered so much, and from whom he still had cause for fear, in the year 1002 Ethelred married Emma, sister of the Duke of Normandy, who was of Danish blood. There were great rejoicings at this union, and it might have been productive of salutary consequences if it had not been followed by an event which set all hopes of peace aside. The rejoicings for the marriage of Ethelred with "the flower of Normandy" were scarcely over when the land was covered with blood and horror. Many of the old Danish settlers in England had become a part of the nation. Some of them had intermarried with the Saxons, and therefore to some extent they had become one people. It may be presumed, however, that during the new incursions of their countrymen, many of them had assumed a haughty and imperious temper towards their Saxon neighbours. In some parts the Saxons appear to have lived in dread of the Danes, for they were accustomed to call those who held rule in any house, "Lord Dane." But this was no justification of the tragedy which followed the marriage of Ethelred with "the flower of Normandy." Brave men fight but do not assassinate. Ethelred, however, as previous pages show, was a coward, and the act of cowardice he now committed will ever remain a foul blot on his memory. At the feast of St. Brice, the 13th of November, Ethelred issued orders for a massacre of the Danes within the district over which he ruled, and on that terrible night there was an indiscriminate slaughter: at one fell blow the good with the evil disposed were slain; the innocent infant at the breast with the hardened ruffian; and the neighbour of years with the intruder of yesterday. The extent of this butchery is unknown, but it is certain that the destruction of life was enormous. The secret had been so well kept that the victims had no warning of their coming fate, a circumstance which proves that the Saxon population who were the executioners were as treacherous and as cruel as their coward king.

It has been seen that during the recent incursions, Sweyn, King of Denmark, and Olave, King of Norway, had carried fire and sword in several parts of the country, and had received Danegeld, as the money paid them was called, to stop their ravages. In order to bind these princes in the bond of amity, it had been stipulated, by a clause in a treaty between them and Ethelred, that they should embrace the Christian religion. Sweyn had been baptised more than once, and had relapsed into idolatry: but he willingly consented to be baptised again, merely, as it proved, as a matter of convenience. Olave was more sincere: the oath which he took at the font never to molest the English again was honourably kept. But it was not so with Sweyn: he looked upon the rite of baptism as an idle ceremony, and therefore he was at all times ready to break his oath, and return to England in quest of more Danegeld. He might have been expected to return at any time, but he had another cause now for returning—revenge. His sister Gunhilda had married an English earl of Danish descent, and had embraced Christianity, and she, after being made to witness the execution of her husband and child on the black night of the massacre of St. Brice, was herself barbarously murdered. It is said that in the agony of her last hours, Gunhilda warned her executioners that a terrible retribution would be taken upon England by her brother Sweyn for this national crime, and so it happened: in less than a year Sweyn was once more in the land with fire and desolation.

No sooner had that fierce warrior Dane heard the tale of horror than he prepared to take a deadly revenge. A large fleet, crowded with Danish warriors all animated by their leader's spirit, set sail for the English coasts. The avengers landed near Exeter in the year 1003, and that city being treacherously surrendered to them by its governor—Earl Hugh, a Norman who had come in the train of Emma—it was plundered and dismantled. Desolation was now spread far and wide. The Danes marched through the country into Wiltshire, everywhere destroying life and property. Henry of Huntingdon says that as "they marched along they compelled the Saxon population to prepare for their repast, and that when they had eaten their viands and drunk their ale, they slew their hosts and set fire to their houses." In the mean time, Ethelred's government were making preparations to meet the Danish hosts. An Anglo-Saxon army marched to stem their onward progress. The command of this army, however, was given to the traitor, Alfric of Mercia, who had before deceived Ethelred, and who, though he had been restored to favour and power, deceived him again. Pretending sudden illness on the eve of a battle, he declined to fight, and Sweyn retired unmolested to the sea coast. In the year 1004 the ravages of the Danes were renewed, and no effort was made to check them. Cities, towns, and villages were plundered and destroyed in the several counties of Norfolk, Suffolk,

Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire, and Lincolnshire, and the lands were laid waste. So fearful were their ravages that a famine was created by them; and then, and not till then, the Danes returned to the Baltic laden with booty. But the vengeance of Sweyn was not yet satisfied. In the year 1006 he again returned, and his fierce hosts roamed over the kingdom with impunity. The country was reduced to the utmost desolation, and the enemy could only be got rid of by the old system of Danegeld, the price of peace being this time thirty-six thousand pounds in gold.

Danegeld had been paid so often that the country was becoming impoverished, and as the demands of the Danes increased at every invasion, a bolder line of policy was adopted. Sweyn departed when he had obtained the gold; but it was clear that either he or some of his race would sooner or later again appear in search of plunder and gold. Preparations were therefore now made to repel all future invasions. It was ordained that proprietors of eight hydes of land should provide each a horseman and a complete suit of armour; and that those who possessed three hundred and ten hydes, should each equip a ship for the defence of the coasts. By this law a large army was raised, and, as old writers assert, so many ships got together in England as "there were never before seen." But all these preparations were rendered abortive by the factions which existed among the nobles. The traitor Alfric was now dead, but he was succeeded in the government of Mercia and the command of the army by a still greater traitor. This was Edric, who had married a sister of Ethelred; but who, notwithstanding, disclosed all the counsels of his sovereign to the enemy, and who found means to frustrate every scheme formed for the defence of the country. By his intrigues, the noble fleet which had been created was rendered useless. Having contrived to create a division among its commanders, some of the ships were carried over to the Danes by Woolfnorth, governor of Sussex, the father of the famous Earl Godwin; and Woolfnorth, being thus made an enemy to the state, subsequently destroyed a portion of the fleet sent against him; and then the remainder dispersed in anarchy and confusion, A.D. 1009.

"The whole nation's toil" having thus "lightly passed away," there was "no let or hindrance" to the invasion of the Danes. A great host, called "Thurkill's host," now appeared in the land, and for three whole years ravaged the country from one end to the other. Every corner which had not been ransacked by former invaders was diligently searched out and ravaged by Thurkill's famed host; and, unlike the former invaders, this horde of Danes never intended to leave the island. They took gold to depart, but they still remained. On one occasion they received forty-eight thousand pounds in gold, with an understanding that they should retire to the Baltic, but they showed no signs of quitting the island. And there was now no power in the land which could drive them out. Councils were from time to time summoned to devise measures to expel the invaders, but either no measures were devised, or they were not carried into execution. The only instance of stern patriotism recorded in this time of general consternation is that of Alphege, Archbishop of Canterbury. Edric, after a series of intrigues, had joined the Danish forces with a large body of men, and laid siege to that city, and Alphege, who had a heart at once bold and true, exhorted the citizens to defend it from the beleaguering hosts. It held out bravely for twenty-one days, but there was a traitor within its walls named Elfman, who secretly admitted the enemy, who burnt the city and carried off its inhabitants as slaves. They demanded ransom of the bold primate, but he sternly refused to give it, alleging that it would be treason in him in any degree to enrich the enemies of England. It was in vain that the Danes renewed their demand. He was not the man, he replied, to provide Christian flesh for pagan teeth, by robbing his own poor countrymen. The brave primate and patriot, Alphege, was murdered in cold blood.

This noble example was lost upon the weak monarch Ethelred. He not only sought to purchase peace with gold, but he now made the formal cession of several counties to Thurkill, who, with a large detachment of his host, became the allies of Ethelred. Thurkill had been despatched by Sweyn, King of Denmark, to complete the conquest of England; and when he heard of this compact between him and Ethelred, he prepared a fresh expedition, which he led to England in person. His fleet sailed up the Humber, and landed towards the city of York, and as his hosts advanced up the country, their march was, as usual, a march of rapine and slaughter. It was also one of triumph. All the inhabitants of Danelagh joined Sweyn at once, and Thurkill and his host readily submitted to him. It seems probable, indeed, that Thurkill had only made peace with Ethelred in order to betray him. Leaving his fleet under the command of his son Canute, the Danish king marched southward, and the gates of every important town were thrown open at his approach. When he arrived at London, however, he met with a repulse. Ethelred had taken refuge there, and its citizens made such a vigorous defence that he was compelled to retire from its walls. But the cause of Ethelred was hopeless. Sweyn having marched westward, all the thanes in that part of the kingdom repaired to his court at Bath, and acknowledged him as their lawful sovereign. Thus betrayed and deserted, Ethelred abandoned London, and, accompanied by his wife and children and a few faithful adherents, he fled to the Isle of Wight, and from thence repaired to Normandy, where, although he had been hostile to Duke Richard, and a faithless husband to his sister Emma, he found a safe and honourable asylum.

Sweyn was now, A.D. 1013, acknowledged "full King of England;" but as he died at Gainsborough about six weeks after, before he was crowned, he is not commonly reckoned among its monarchs. His army proclaimed his son Canute king, but the death of Sweyn revived the spirits of the English, and inspired them with the resolution of attempting the deliverance of their country from the Danish yoke. All the Witan who were in England, clergy and laity, by whom he had been abandoned and betrayed, recalled Ethelred to his throne. On his return it was declared that every Danish king should be an outlaw

from England for ever. A compact was also entered into between Ethelred and his Witan. He was to be henceforth a dear lord to his people if he would rule them "rightlier than before;" and the people were to be equally dear to him if they "would obey him without deceit." But all this was idle ceremony. As for there being no Danish king in England, that was a matter to be settled by the sword, and not by words. North of Watling Street there *was* a Danish king all-powerful, one who was not disposed to relinquish his hold in the island without a struggle. Canute had been elected by the northern provinces as their king, and they and their English adherents were in a condition to maintain that election. War was renewed, but treachery was still rampant in the camp of Ethelred. The arch-traitor Edric, "who kept his old power with his old guile," in Mercia, was circumventing the king at every step, and Canute was establishing his claim to the full sovereignty of England, when, in the April of A.D. 1016, Ethelred died, after a miserable reign of thirty-eight years.

Edmund II., *or Ironside.*—In the war which had been waged between Ethelred and Canute, and which continued for three years, the chief leader on the side of the Saxons was Edmund, a natural son of King Ethelred, and who for his great bodily strength was called Ironside. Edmund was a hero, and had it not been for his skill and valour, the struggle against the power of Canute could not have been so long maintained, especially as Edric had towards the close of that struggle thrown off the mask and gone over to the enemy. It was no wonder, then, that when Ethelred died—the law of succession being still undefined—that the Saxons set aside the legitimate issue of Ethelred, and chose Edmund for their king. At least such was the choice of the citizens of London, where he was crowned by Livignus, Archbishop of Canterbury; but a council sitting at Southampton, which had previously pronounced a sentence of outlawry against every Danish king of name and race, took the oaths to Canute.

If any one at this crisis of the country could have delivered it from the Danish sway, that man would have been Edmund Ironside. He was great both in the council-chamber and in the battle-field. But there was still treachery in the court and in the camp, which baffled all his efforts to restore the independence of the Saxon kingdom. Nevertheless, he continued the war with wonderful energy and great ability. At the head of his forces he boldly marched into Wessex, and was there accepted as king. He then raised the siege of London, and in a brief space of time fought five pitched battles, and thrice relieved London from the power of Canute. There never was a more active or bloody campaign in England than this in the year 1016. If it had not been for that false confidence which had ruined his father, it is probable that Edmund would soon have cleared the land of his enemies. Edric had plotted against his life and liberty before he had thrown off the mask and gone over to the Danes; but we again find him holding a command in the Saxon army. He had once more changed sides, but only to act with his old treachery. In the last battle fought, victory was about to declare for the English when Edric called out to his followers that Edmund was dead, and the battle was lost. The English fled in confusion. The courage of the brave Edmund, however, was still unsubdued. He felt, indeed, that he could place no confidence in his chiefs, and that if he could secure the independence of the kingdom, it must be by his own arm alone. He proposed that he and his rival should decide their claims in a single combat. But Canute was too wise to risk his life in an encounter with the stalwart Edmund. It would be wiser and better, he said, to divide England between them, as their forefathers had done. This proposal was received with joy by both armies, and the sovereignty was accordingly divided: Canute was to reign over the north; that is, Northumberland and Mercia; and Edmund over the rest of the kingdom, with a nominal superiority over the Danish portion. But the brave Edmund did not survive this treaty more than two months. He was murdered at Oxford in a mysterious manner on the feast of St. Andrew; and it is generally believed that it was the hand of the traitor Edric that struck the fatal blow, and that Canute was the instigator of the crime. This, indeed, appears probable, as Canute took an early opportunity of insuring the traitor's silence; for when Edric came to urge rewards for services rendered, Canute replied that a new lord could expect no fealty from one who had murdered his old lord, upon which hint, Eric of Northumbria slew the traitor with his battle-axe. Dead men tell no tales.

Canute.—Canute, now sole King of England, A.D. 1017, commenced his reign with a show of law and moderation. He had gained power by the sword, but he deemed it prudent to have his claims acknowledged by the nation's representatives. Edmund had left two sons—Edwin and Edward, both minors—and before he seized their dominions he summoned the Witan to fix the succession of the kingdom. In this assembly it was falsely affirmed by some of the nobles who were in Canute's interest, that his succession had been stipulated in the late convention; and this evidence being supported by his power, the Saxon chiefs took an oath of fidelity to him as their king, and he in return took an oath that he would rule justly and honourably.

At the great council at which Canute was acknowledged king he promised a full amnesty. No sooner, however, was he fairly seated on the throne than he commenced a system of wholesale proscription. Those Saxon chiefs who had proved his sternest opponents in his battles for the crown, were either banished or put to death. His vengeance especially fell on the relations of Edmund and Ethelred. The obsequious Witan had declared that it was Edmund's express wish that he should be the guardian of his two sons, and he accepted the trust. His guardianship, however, consisted in outlawing the two boy princes. It would have been dangerous for him to have murdered them in England, but he sent them to his ally and vassal, the King of Sweden, with instructions to dispose of them in such a manner as should best serve his interests. The dark hint was understood, but the Swedish monarch recoiled at the thought of becoming an assassin of infants. Touched with pity for them, he sent them to the court of Hungary, where they

found a safe asylum. Under the care of Solomon, King of Hungary, the boys grew up to manhood, and Edwin, the elder, became united in marriage to the Hungarian monarch's sister, and Edward, the younger, to his sister-in-law, Agatha, daughter of the Emperor Henry II. of Germany. Edwin died without issue; but Edward had issue, Edgar Atheling, Margaret, afterwards Queen of Scotland, and Christina, who retired into a convent.

In order to secure his crown, Canute rewarded some of his most powerful followers with the richest governments. Thurkill, who had paved the way to his throne by ravaging the kingdom for three whole years, and who had allied himself with Ethelred in order to betray him, and had fought under his banner against the renowned Edmund Ironside, was made Duke of East Anglia; Eric, another Danish chieftain, was made Duke of Northumbria; and the traitor Edric was confirmed in his government of Mercia. No sooner, however, did Canute find himself in the peaceable possession of the crown, than he contrived to get rid of all these powerful chieftains. The fate of Edric has been seen: Thurkill and Eric, who were dangerous and powerful subjects, were deprived of their estates and honours and banished the kingdom. By these means the whole kingdom was reduced to a state of perfect subjection to the authority of King Canute.

There were still, however, two princes whose claims to the crown of England might some day cause disquiet to Canute. These were Edward and Alfred, sons of King Ethelred, who was with their mother Emma at the court of their uncle, Richard of Normandy. At first, Duke Richard had sent an embassy to Canute, demanding the restitution of the kingdom; but he shortly after entered into friendly negotiations with him, and the dispute was finally settled by Canute offering to marry the widowed "Flower of Normandy." Dazzled with the lustre of a crown she had already worn, Emma gave her hand to the great enemy of her family, and once more ascended the throne of England, A.D. 1017.

Having established his rule in England beyond all danger of a revolution, Canute ruled with a milder sway. At the same time, though he is praised by the old chroniclers for his merciful forbearance, there appears to have been great injustice suffered by the Saxon population. The power of the "Lord Danes" became paramount in all the great cities, as in London, and his warriors still insulted and robbed the people. Lest another day of St. Brice should occur, a fine was imposed upon any township where a Dane was killed, but a Saxon might be slain with impunity. This certainly was not evenhanded justice. At the same time, Canute seems partially, if not altogether, to have gained the goodwill of his Saxon subjects. In the year 1019, a body of English troops under Earl Godwin willingly followed him to a war in which he was then engaged with Sweden, and in which they did such good service that Godwin received the highest marks of the royal favour. Subsequently, in the year 1028 the English aided him in the conquest of Norway; and in the next A.D. 1031 they were employed against the Cambrians and Scots, who refused to pay him homage on the ground that he was an usurper. They were, however, now finally compelled to submit to his power and pay him Danegeld, or tribute.

SILVER COIN OF CANUTE.

Hitherto the character of Canute as it stands in the page of history is clear and legible. In that page he is depicted successively as a marauder, an avenger, and a conqueror. His greed for gold is represented as being so great, that he made no scruple of professing Christianity to obtain it, and then turning pagan again; and his love of power so absorbing, that whoever stood in his way of securing it was slain or banished without compunction. Having attained the summit of his wishes, however, according to monkish historians, as if by a miracle he all at once becomes a reformed character, and the model of a Christian monarch. He erects churches, he endows monasteries, enriches ecclesiastics, and bestows revenues on chantries where prayers were appointed to be said or sung for the repose of the souls of those who had fallen in battle against him. There never was such a monarch as King Canute if these monkish chroniclers have itemed down the truth. When he received the waters of baptism in sincerity and truth we are not informed, but if he ever did so it must have been before the year 1030, for we find that at that period with his staff and wallet he made a pilgrimage to Rome. Had he then been a pagan it cannot be supposed that he would have laid aside his gorgeous crown for the garb of a pilgrim. And yet we are told that it was when Canute was at Rome, that under the teaching of the Romish church he first "thought humbly of his past life, and made good resolutions for his future career." If the pen of the flatterer instead of the faithful historian has not been at work in recording the after life of this remarkable monarch the good resolutions which he made at Rome were put into practice. On his return, as he passed through Denmark he is represented as having addressed a letter to "all the nations of the English," in which he said that he had dedicated his life to God to govern his kingdoms—England, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway—with justice; and that if in past time, in the violence and carelessness of youth, he had violated justice, by God's help he would make compensation. In this same letter he is said to have commanded all those to whom he had entrusted the government, if they wished to preserve his favour, and save their own souls, to do no injustice either to the poor or the rich, and to supply his treasury according to the laws of the land, for that he wanted "no money raised by unlawful means." Here was a change, indeed, in one who in common with his race had shown such a greed for gold as not to spare even life that it might be obtained. Without assenting, however, to the statement of the monkish historians that Canute in his latter days was a reformed character in the genuine sense of that term, it does appear that, having

reached the summit of his ambition, some right principles of action predominated in his mind. Thus on his return from Rome he enacted laws with the consent of his Witan, at Winchester which were of a twofold character, ecclesiastical and secular. In the former he enforced church dues rigidly, enjoined continence upon the priests, and prohibited hunting and works of labour on the Sabbath; in the latter he interdicted all heathen customs brought into the country by the Danes; commanded all incorrigible foreigners to quit England with "their possessions and their sins;" directed his reeves to provide for him justly out of his own substance, and not from that of his subjects; and ordained that heiresses and widows possessed of wealth, who were often forcibly abducted, should be protected from constrained marriage. That Canute sought popularity in his declining years there can be no question. His liberality to the church made him popular with the clergy; his reward of merit, as in the case of Godwin, who, from an obscure origin was invested with an earldom, made him popular with the army; and his patronage of the scalds, minstrels, gleemen, poets, and musicians, raised him in the estimation of the Saxon population. On the whole, indeed, the latter part of the reign of Canute was a happier time for England than had been known since the days of Alfred and Athelstane. It cannot be said of him, as the quaint Fuller said of Alfred, "He left learning where he found ignorance; justice where he found oppression; and peace where he found distraction;" but he performed an achievement which only a monarch possessed of a powerful will and a knowledge of the art of ruling could have effected—he brought order out of anarchy.

Henry of Huntingdon relates an anecdote of Canute, which, if true, at once shows his power as a monarch, and the adulation of his courtiers. He says: "When all things seemed to bend to his lordly will, Canute one day, disgusted with the flattery of his courtiers, determined to read them a practical lesson. He gathered them around him on the sea-shore, and seated on a chair near the water-line, he commanded the onward rolling waves to respect the greatest of all sea kings. But the waves heeded him not. They rolled on in their course, each succeeding wave breaking nearer and nearer to his feet, till at length their onward flow compelled a precipitate retreat. 'Confess now,' exclaimed Canute to his flatterers, 'how frivolous and vain is the might of an earthly king compared to that great power who rules the elements, and who alone can say to the ocean 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther.'" It is not mentioned when Canute thus rebuked his courtiers and exhibited this unwonted humility; but the chronicler adds that he then took off his crown, and depositing it in the cathedral of Winchester, never wore it again.

Canute died at Shaftesbury A.D. 1035, leaving three sons, Sweyn, Harold, and Hardicanute. He was buried at Winchester among the old Saxon kings, which shows how completely he had identified himself with his English subjects. It also marks a great change in the manners of the Danes; for of old they despised any other mode of burial than that in the open fields, or hills under huge caverns or monumental stones. Indeed, the Saxons and the Danes at this period had become more completely than ever one people; worshipping with each other in the churches which the Danes had once sedulously destroyed; intermarrying with each other at the altar; and at length finally resting together in the cold and silent grave. But while the races had become intermixed, evident traces of which may be discerned to this day, the main bulk and body of the English nation were of Saxon origin.

Harold Harefoot.—The death of Canute was followed by a contention about the succession. Sweyn and Harold are represented as being illegitimate: Hardicanute was the son of Emma of Normandy. The sons of Ethelred by Emma were still in Normandy, and those of Edmund Ironside in Hungary. The contention lay between Harold and Hardicanute, for Sweyn in his father's lifetime had received his portion of his father's dominions—the kingdom of Norway. At the demise of his father, Hardicanute was in Denmark, so that only Harold, who is called Harefoot from his agility in the chase, was on the spot. It appears to have been his father's intention that Harold should succeed him on the throne of England; for illegitimacy at this period was no barrier to its possession. Harold, therefore, seized his father's treasures, and claimed his crown. He was supported in his claim by the Danes in the north—Leofric, Earl of Mercia, being their leader—and by the citizens of London; but the powerful Earl Godwin, and the Saxons of the south generally, either wished to have one of the sons of Ethelred for their king, or Hardicanute, the son of Emma. A civil war was imminent. Both sides prepared for it, and many families fled to the morasses and fens to avoid its horrors, but a compromise was effected by a partition of the kingdom. Harold was to possess London, and all the country north of the Thames, and Hardicanute all the country south of that river.

In the absence of Hardicanute, it was agreed that his mother, with Earl Godwin, should govern on his behalf, and she fixed her court at Winchester.

WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

Hardicanute appears to have been in no haste to take possession of a divided throne, and Harold soon claimed to be supreme King of all England. Meanwhile, the two sons of Ethelred, by Emma, made attempts to regain the throne of their Saxon ancestors. Edward the eldest came first. With a few ships he sailed to Southampton, and marched towards his mother's court at Winchester. But Emma had lost all affection for her sons by Ethelred: they had become to that heartless woman as aliens and strangers. As Edward marched along he found that his mother had set the whole country in array against him, and he fled back to his ships and set sail for Normandy. The younger brother Alfred now tried his fortune; tempted thereto, it is said, by a letter of invitation written in the name of his mother Emma. If that letter was genuine, Queen Emma must have been an unnatural parent indeed, for its object was to insure the death of the young prince. It would rather appear, however, to have emanated from Earl Godwin, who, although he was still apparently on the side of Emma and Hardicanute, had in reality been gained over to Harold's interests. Alfred landed at Canterbury, where he was warmly received by Archbishop Ethelnoth and by the people of Kent. Thus supported, Alfred marched with the forces he had brought with him up the country, and during his progress he was met by Earl Godwin, who conducted him to Guildford. It is said that Godwin swore to protect him, and to conduct him to his mother Emma, but if so he proved a traitor. Alfred and his followers were billeted at Guildford in small parties, and Godwin left him there; but in the dead of the night the forces of Harold burst in upon them, and but few escaped with their lives. Alfred was taken prisoner, and carried first to London and from thence to the Isle of Ely, where at a mock trial before a court of brutal Danes he was condemned to lose his eyes. This foul sentence was immediately put into execution, and under circumstances of such wanton barbarity that Alfred died from the anguish a few days after in the monastery of Ely. There is much confusion in the accounts of the events of this reign; but it would appear that Godwin now openly espoused the cause of Harold, and that from this cause on hearing of the fate of Alfred, Emma fled out of the country, and took refuge at Bruges, the court of the Earl of Flanders.

Harold was now, A.D. 1037, proclaimed full King of England. He does not appear, however, to have been accepted as their sovereign by the Saxon population; and more especially by the Saxon hierarchy and priesthood. It is said that Ethelnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, refused to crown him, and that he took it from the altar and placed it on his own head; but it seems doubtful whether he was ever crowned at all. If he was he did not long retain his ill-gotten power, for after a short reign he died and was buried at Westminster, A.D. 1040.

Hardicanute.—Hardicanute was now unanimously invited to repair to England to fill the vacant throne. He was at Bruges on a visit to his mother when a deputation of Danes gave him the invitation, and joyfully accepting it he hastened to take possession of his kingdom. He arrived at Sandwich with a fleet of forty ships—a fleet which he had prepared for a hostile descent on the country he was thus called upon to govern. There were great rejoicings among all ranks when Hardicanute appeared in England, but that joy was not of long duration. It was soon discovered that this king of their choice was ferocious and arbitrary, one whose violent passions, and not the laws of his country, became the rule of his administration. On his arrival, Hardicanute set an example of that paltry vengeance which in later years disgraced the restoration of the Stuarts. His rage against Harold was so implacable that he caused his body to be disinterred, decapitated, and then thrown into the Thames. Some of the old writers assert that Earl Godwin assisted in executing these commands; but it does not appear clear from their statements whether he did so by compulsion, or with a view of gaining favour with the arbitrary monarch. It is quite clear, however, that Godwin, who stood accused of being a participator in the guilt of Alfred's murder, propitiated Hardicanute with splendid presents, and that finally, with the queen-mother Emma, who had returned to England, he was suffered to rule the kingdom.

Hardicanute revenged himself on the living as well as the dead. In his train he had brought with him numerous Danish chiefs and courtiers, to support whom he had frequent recourse to the odious tax of Danegeld. This was fatal to his popularity. The arbitrary levying of this tax by his Huscarles, or household troops, caused frequent commotions. The people of Worcester and Exeter revolted, and were severely punished. The people of Worcester having slain two of the collectors of this tax, the Earls Leofric, Seward, and Godwin were ordered to destroy the city and its inhabitants. Worcester was burnt to the ground and a great part of the surrounding country laid desolate, but the people, having escaped to an island in the Severn, avoided destruction. Hoveden says that they afterwards returned and rebuilt their city.

It was now especially that Earl Godwin and the queen-mother Emma divided the chief authority of the government between them. Hardicanute abandoned himself to pleasure. His chief enjoyment appears to have consisted in eating and drinking. The old chroniclers affirm that his table was spread four times a-day, and that his carousals went far into the silent hours of the night. The sociality of Hardicanute and the Danish courtiers was more injurious to the Saxons than their severities. Intemperate before, they now sank deeper into sensuality. But Hardicanute's example was soon cut short. This last of the Danish kings quickly made an end of his feasts and dominion. As he was carousing at the wedding of a Danish thane at Clapham, while in the act of lifting the wine-cup to his lips to pledge the jovial company, he fell down speechless and soon after expired. He was buried at Winchester, A.D. 1042.

Edward the Confessor.—Edward, the only surviving son of Ethelred and Emma of Normandy, had during the brief reign of Hardicanute arrived in England, where he appears to have been warmly welcomed: at least, if his mother Emma still looked upon him with a jealous eye, it is recorded to the honour of Hardicanute that he treated him with kindness.

At this time, there were only two princes who had a legitimate claim to the throne: Edward, the son of Ethelred, and Edward, the son of Edmund Ironside. This latter, who is called "Edward the Exile," was still in Hungary; but Edward, who was surnamed "the Confessor," was at hand. It might have been supposed that the Danes would have contested the succession, but there was no descendant of Canute around whom they could rally, and at this period the power of the Saxon population preponderated. The Saxons, therefore, resolved to seize this opportunity of restoring the ancient line of kings to the throne: a consummation they had long devoutly wished. The memories of Alfred, and the first Edward, and Athelstane, were still fondly cherished from one end of the kingdom to the other. Their names and deeds were perpetuated in their national songs and traditions, and they longed for a king to reign over them, who had descended from their loins. The violences of Harold and Hardicanute, also, had done much in bringing about a general desire to be rid of the Danish rule. The nobles and prelates of the Saxons, therefore, assembled in London, and elected Edward the Confessor as their future sovereign. William of Malmesbury says that Edward, who was timid and unambitious, was struck with dread at their election, and that, fearing a violent opposition from the Danes, he meditated an escape into Normandy; but there was no opposition, and, if there had been, the powerful Earl Godwin undertook to defend his throne.

Earl Godwin became the king-maker of this period. The origin of this remarkable man is involved in mystery. It is said that he was the son of a Saxon herdsman, and the following romantic story is told of his rescue from obscurity. After the great and decisive battle between Canute and Edmund, a Danish chief, named Ulfr, became separated from the army, and was lost in a wood. Seeing a lad driving his cattle to pasture, Ulfr asked him the way to the Danish fleet. He replied, the way was long and the dangers great, and he should be in danger if he assisted an enemy of his country. Ulfr offered him gold, but he could not tempt him. Finally, however, he led the thane to his father's house, by whose consent the boy guided him to Canute's camp. His services were rewarded, and he entered the Danish army where he rose rapidly to favour: Ulfr gave him his sister in marriage, and the herdsman's son became an earl. This account of the origin of Godwin is derived by Turner from a northern Saga; but other accounts say that he was the son of that traitorous governor of Sussex, Woolfnorth, who, in the year 1009, went over with several of the ships under his command to the Danes, and who subsequently destroyed a considerable portion of the English fleet. But whatever his origin may have been, it is certain that at the accession of Edward, Earl Godwin was the most powerful chief in the kingdom. The earldom which he held included Sussex, Kent, and part of Wessex. He had several sons, also, of considerable note in the kingdom: with their father, Harold and Sweyn were lords of all the land from the Humber to the Severn; while his other sons, Wulnoth, Tostig, Gurth, and Leofwin, were advanced to high dignities. Some of these dignities may have been conferred after Edward's accession; but it is clear that, at that period, the family of Godwin held proud positions in the state. This would indicate that, if the origin of this family was originally humble, their rise was not of modern date; for although there are examples in history of men winning their way to greatness by the power of the sword, it is rare to find whole families reaping the fruits thereof. But great as he was, Earl Godwin was ambitious of becoming still greater and more powerful. He promised to support Edward on his throne, but he was to have his price for that support. There is nothing like the sword in this world for attaining power and greatness. By it, men have won their way to thrones, and have founded dynasties: some of an ephemeral nature, and others more enduring. Such was the end of Godwin's ambition. He would use his sword to establish Edward on the throne of his ancestors, but it was on condition that he married his daughter Editha, and was secured, together with his family, in the possession of the estates and honours they had obtained under the rule of the Danes. To these conditions Edward consented, and he received a kingdom and a wife at the same time. Editha, who by Ingulphus is called "a rose" and the "daughter of a thorn," and who is said to have been "skilled in verse, grammar, and logic," became the wife of a king; but she was doomed to rue the day when she was thus exalted to a throne. Bred up in the superstitions of the cloister, Edward first neglected this rose which sprang from a thorn and afterwards became her persecutor.

There were two other Saxon chieftains who shared power in England with Godwin under King Edward: Leofric, whose sway extended over the northern counties of Mercia; and Siward, whose authority reached from the Humber to the borders of Scotland.

Edward commenced his reign in a vindictive spirit. His mother, Emma, had first neglected and then persecuted him, but still she was his mother, and he might have forgiven, if he could not have forgotten, the injuries he had received at her hands. But he would do neither. His coronation was delayed, in consequence of a famine accompanied by a pestilence, till Easter, A.D. 1042, when he was consecrated king by Eadsig, archbishop of Canterbury; and immediately after, he held a council at Gloucester, from whence, accompanied by Godwin, Leofric, and Siward, he proceeded to Winchester, where his mother, Emma, resided, and seized all her treasures, cattle, and corn, and the forage on the lands which she possessed as her dower. It is related that she was committed to close custody in the abbey of Wherwell, and it is certain that she passed the rest of her life in obscurity—dying in the tenth year of his reign. It would appear that the treasures of his mother, Emma, influenced him in his persecution of her, for at his accession the crown was much impoverished. To enrich it he also made a general revocation of grants made by the late kings, by which he obtained a great accession of wealth and power. This was a severe blow to many families; but as it chiefly fell on those of Danish origin, and as it enabled him to remit the odious tax, called Danegeld, these methods of enriching the crown, however exceptionable, rendered him popular.

The throne of England was well upheld at the beginning of Edward's reign by his three great supporters. There appears, however, to have been much injustice shown towards the Danish population. Many of them were expelled the country, while those who remained were subjected to considerable persecution. Overjoyed at seeing a prince of their ancient royal family on the throne, the Saxons committed many outrages on the Danes. Indeed, the remembrance of this revolution was long preserved in England by an anniversary, called Hokeday, on which the people acted a representation of the insults and indignities which the Danes underwent at this period. The revolution was complete: the Saxon completely triumphed over the Dane. Magnus, King of Denmark and Sweden, made a demonstration to re-establish the Scandinavian supremacy, but the bold front, shown by Godwin, Leofric, and Siward, induced him to relinquish the enterprise. But though undisturbed by foreign invasions or internal wars, Edward was, in reality, only a king in name. His power was nominal: the three great earls ruled, and he was entirely dependent on them for that shadow of a substance. His condition was, indeed, abject, and the more so as he lacked vigour of character. His education was that of a monk, rather than the descendant of a long line of kings; and, hence, when danger came—as come it did—it required a firmer hand than his to avert it.

For some time, however, Edward was a popular monarch. He not only endeared himself to his people by the abolition of the tax, called Danegeld, but by reviving the old Saxon laws, and providing for their administration with justice and promptitude. His virtues and ascetic devotion also gained their reverence; and had he been wise and prudent, he might have reigned by the popular will of the people, and have been able to despise the undue power of his nobles, by which his throne, from the very first commencement of his reign, was endangered. But Edward, though pious, was not prudent. No sooner had he removed some of his people's grievances, than he sowed the seeds of new discontent and disaster, broadcast. It is natural to suppose that, having been educated in Normandy, and having lived in that country from the thirteenth to the fortieth year of his age, he had contracted many friendships among the Normans. The Normans had been his friends in his adversity, and it was right that he should preserve friendship with them in his prosperity; but, unfortunately, he abandoned himself without restraint in the indulgence of his personal predilections. He seemed to forget that he was a Saxon-born native of the realm, and that he was called upon to rule over a Saxon people who had cause to fear all foreign interference. Relying on his friendship, several Normans came over with him, when he first came to England, and when he ascended the throne, others came over to offer him their congratulations. As he provided for all these in church and state, fresh swarms of them arrived in England, and in a little time, his court became crowded with Normans, all hungering and thirsting for the patronage he was too willing to accord them. They literally basked in the sunshine of Edward's favour. The Normans became his confidants, chaplains, and official agents. It was, ever, in the church that he chiefly provided f Norman friends. Croziers and abbots' staves liberally given them; to the almost utter exc of the Saxon clergy. A Norman, named Rober made archbishop of Canterbury; Ulf was made b of London; and William, bishop of Dorchester.

FONT, DORCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

was this all that was calculated to give offence Saxon subjects. If any one among them desi prosper at court, it became absolutely necessary he should speak French and adopt the No costume. Norman-French, indeed, was not onl one language used at court, but it supersede Anglo-Saxon in all Edward's charters and docun The cross, even, that ancient mark which had used by all the Anglo-Saxon kings as a royal s ture to charters and documents sanctioned by was exchanged for the Norman fashion of a se pended to the signature. Finally, every one nected with the king's court or the law courts obliged to study the Norman-French in order t ploy a foreign tongue in their deeds and paper they might be understood by his foreign mini for not one of them condescended to make them acquainted with the language spoken by the p among whom they had come to reside.

Such changes as these would, in our days, brought about a revolution; and it is no wonde they became distasteful to the Saxon people. Godwin was enraged beyond measure at the patr bestowed on so many Normans, especially as said to have expressly stipulated with Edward, b he consented to raise him to the throne, that forei should have no power in church and state: a po which he was exceedingly jealous. Godwin also irritated by the circumstance that, while Ed lavished his favours on his Norman favourites, h only shunned the society both of himself and his but also ill-treated his daughter Editha, whom b the altar he had sworn to love and cherish. A

Malmesbury naïvely asks, "Is it astonishing that the author and supporter of Edward's reign should be wroth to see new men of a foreign nation preferred to himself?" Irritated as he was, however, it does not appear that Godwin precipitated the crisis that ensued: on the contrary, that was brought about by the imprudent monarch himself.

An incident which happened in the year 1050 fanned the discontent of Godwin—and in which the Saxon population shared—into an open flame. Eustace, Count of Boulogne, had married Goda, a sister of King Edward, and he came on a visit to his brother-in-law with a great retinue. At his court, he saw that the French and the Normans were in the ascendant—that the Saxons were a despised people, or as he conceived, born slaves. His visit was, no doubt, a very pleasant one: a visit long to be remembered. But before he reached Boulogne, the pleasures of his visit to England were sadly marred. On his arrival at Dover, he and his followers entered it in warlike harness, and im-

ENTRANCE, DOVER CASTLE.

peratively demanded quarters of the burghers. This insolent mandate was refused, and the French instantly proceeded to choose lodgings for themselves. One burgher, however, was bold enough to repel an invader of his castle—for every man's house was as much his castle, throughout England, in those days as in our own. Thus repelled, the stranger drew his sword and wounded the burgher, and a fray ensued, in which the Frenchman was slain. Eustace and his followers now surrounded the house, and forcing their way in, murdered the burgher on his own hearth. This done, as the people raised a cry of vengeance, Eustace and his spearmen made a furious onslaught upon them, and many were slain. But they paid dearly for their temerity. Arming themselves, the Kentish men formed into military order and encountered the mailed horsemen of Boulogne; and, after a fierce conflict, many of them were slain, and many more wounded. Eustace himself, with a few followers, escaped, and, hastening back to the court of Edward at Gloucester, laid his complaints before him. All the blame was thrown on the burghers of Dover: none rested with Eustace and his horsemen. Enraged at his tale, Edward sent to Godwin, in whose earldom Dover was situated, commanding him to visit the burghers of that city with summary vengeance. No doubt, Godwin had long watched for a favourable opportunity to break with Edward: it now presented itself. "It ill becomes the king," he replied, "to condemn, without a hearing, those whom it is his duty to protect." He proposed that the magistrates of Dover should be legally cited before the king and the royal judges to answer for their conduct. No proposition could be more reasonable or just; but Edward's courtiers denounced Godwin's refusal to exercise indiscriminate vengeance as an act of rebellion. Godwin was summoned to appear before the king at Gloucester; but as he conceived his life would be in danger among foreigners, he disregarded the summons. Edward now threatened both him and his family with banishment and confiscation, and the great earl armed his retainers to war with the sovereign he had created. He had justice on his side, and his cause was popular: there was no difficulty in raising an army to redress the popular grievances. Many voluntarily took up arms, for it was felt that the hour of resistance was come, and that the laws and independence of Saxon England must now, or never, be supported.

At the head of their forces, Godwin and his sons marched to Gloucester, and demanded that Eustace and his followers and many Normans and Frenchmen should be delivered to their custody. Afraid to give a bold denial to their request, and in order to gain time for resistance, Edward opened a negotiation. Meanwhile, he summoned Leofric, Earl of Mercia, Siward, Earl of Northumbria, and Ranulf, or Ralph, a Norman knight whom he had made Earl of Worcestershire, to come to his assistance. They came, and their united forces were superior in numbers to those of Godwin and his sons: for all these earls were anxious to secure the downfall of the great king-maker. Civil war seemed imminent, but on the eve of a battle it was proposed that the king and Godwin should meet on a day named in conference at London. Accordingly, hostages and oaths were exchanged: Edward and Godwin swearing "God's peace and full friendship" for each other. But this compact was evidently entered into by Edward to insure Godwin's ruin. It was a deep-laid plot, probably suggested by the Anglo-Danish chieftains the more effectually to secure the downfall of their great Anglo-Saxon rival than by the chances of a battle. The plot succeeded. Edward, on the advice of his Norman counsellors, now issued a ban for levying of a royal army all over the kingdom, and strengthened his cause by calling in foreign mercenaries. London became beleaguered with his forces: a great host being cantoned within and without the walls of the city. On the other hand, most of Godwin's forces, when "God's peace" and mutual friendship had been sworn between him and his treacherous sovereign, returned to their homes. It was under these circumstances, that Godwin and his sons were summoned to attend the Witan in London. Fearing treachery, however, they refused to attend, unless pledges and hostages were given for their personal safety. This reasonable demand was twice made, and twice refused: the summons, therefore, was disobeyed. Edward and the council now proceeded to

judge them in their absence: unless they appeared within five days, the great earl and his family were to be banished the kingdom for ever, and their estates and honours confiscated. There was no alternative: they had now but a small army to support their cause, and they fled for their lives. Godwin, with his wife and three sons, Sweyn, Gurth, and Tostig, took shelter in the court of Baldwin, Earl of Flanders, whose daughter Tostig had married; and Harold and Leofwin retired into Ireland. Even Editha, the partner of the throne of Edward, was involved in the ruin of her family, for she was stripped of her money, lands, and jewels, and immured in the cheerless monastery of Wherwell. As for the lands and honours of Godwin and his sons, there was a perfect scramble for them by those who had supported Edward; but most of them fell into the hands of his Norman favourites.

The Normans now were more favoured than ever: they came flocking into England as "doves to their windows," in search of fortunes. Among those who came at this eventful period, was the future conqueror of England, William, the young Duke of Normandy, who was the seventh in descent from Rollo the great founder of that kingdom. Others came to seek honours and emoluments: William came to see whether, on some future occasion, he could not secure a throne. He was Edward's cousin, and Edward had no offspring: his chance therefore was great, especially as at this time Norman influence everywhere preponderated, and almost every post of honour and distinction was occupied by his countrymen. William was warmly welcomed by King Edward, and the old chroniclers say that they live lovingly together, and that when he returned he was laden with rich presents bestowed upon him by his royal cousin. Some of William's partisans assert that there was an understanding between these loving cousins, that William, who at this time was about twenty-six years of age, should at the death of Edward succeed to the throne of England, but there is no direct evidence of such a compact. It is, however, probable that Robert the Norman archbishop of Canterbury gave him to understand that such was Edward's intention, without having any authority for making such a declaration. It is evident, indeed, that the Normans had at this time arrived at the comfortable conclusion that henceforth our fair island would be the home of their children, for from that date of William's visit to the court of Edward, they became more insolent than ever to the Saxon population.

But while they were exulting in their domination, preparations were being made to curb their power. Godwin was stripped of his honours and estates, but he still lived to revenge the injuries and repair the losses which he had suffered. Moreover, banishment and confiscation were of little avail, so long as Godwin and his sons could command the sympathies of their Saxon brethren. And that sympathy, from the insolence and rapacity of the Norman fortune-seekers, daily and hourly increased. A Saxon himself, Godwin knew the real character of the Saxon population: that though they might for a time submit to foreign insolence they would one day smite those who trod them under foot. His sons, also, inherited the spirit of their father. There was not one among them who could sit down quietly under the wrongs they had endured. Revenge and ambition animated the breast of every member of this remarkable family. In those days, communications were received at distant dates, but it is evident no time was lost: that while Godwin, and some of his sons were in Flanders and others in Ireland, operations were concerted between them. They had been stripped of their honours and estates, but they had sailed away with treasures—that is gold, the sinews of war; and even if they had not, the prestige of their names would have procured them the means required for their enterprise. Nations at the present day in their wars—just or unjust—frequently have recourse to money-lenders to enable them to rush into the field of battle. But however this may be in the instance before us, Earl Godwin found means to restore himself and family to all they had lost: nay to become more powerful than ever in the kingdom. Their restoration to their honours and estates is, indeed, one of the most remarkable events in this critical period of English history. In the year 1052, Harold and Leofwin sailed from Ireland, and entering the Severn, landed, and defeated all the Anglo-Danish thanes by whom they were opposed and triumphantly ravaged their districts. Meanwhile Godwin with a fleet fitted out in Flanders, sailed to the coasts of his old earldom and was received with open arms by all the people of the country. Harold joined him at Portland, and there was a general rising in their favour. Godwin was as great as ever. He seized the king's ships, received hostages, and obtained supplies at every place he touched. At length he sailed up the Thames: his army increasing in numbers as he went along. He landed at Southwark without opposition: for the people of Southwark and the citizens of London were as well affected towards him, as those of Kent and the adjacent counties. His progress was one of continual triumphs. The Court was alarmed, but for a time Edward stood firm. Twice messengers were sent by Godwin, to demand of him the recall of the irregular sentence of the exile of himself and family, and the restoration of their estates and honours, and twice the demand was refused. But resistance was vain. Edward had ships in the Thames, and an army at hand; but there was neither mariner nor soldier who would risk their lives in his cause. The two fleets and armies were drawn up on the opposite banks of the river, but the royal troops deserted in numbers to Godwin's party, and all expressed their unwillingness to pull their bows and draw their swords against their brethren. Edward's firmness now gave way: he consented to negotiate with his hated father-in-law. That consent was the signal for the flight of the Normans. Bishops, courtiers, and soldiers fled in all directions: some taking refuge in the castles and fortresses commanded by Normans, and others making for the Bristol Channel, from whence they sailed for the Continent. There was a great clearance of these domineering foreigners, from the church, the court, and the camp. Godwin's triumph was complete. The Witan assembled, and decreed the restoration of Godwin and his family to their estates and honours; holding them innocent of the acts imputed to them, and at the same time declaring all the King's Norman favourites

outlaws. As a completion of the great Earl's triumph, Editha, who in her captivity in the monastery of Wherwell had "in tears and prayers expected the day of her release and comfort," was restored to court and all her honours as queen.

Godwin and his sons, with the exception of Sweyn, received full restitution. Early in the reign of Edward, Sweyn had been outlawed for the forcible abduction of an abbess, after which he became a pirate and the terror of the sea. He had been pardoned; but on his return he had murdered his cousin Beorn, who with his own brother Harold had opposed the royal clemency. Still, when his family was banished, he was in the possession of his honours and estates, and as before seen he became an exile in Flanders. This time his sentence was not reversed, and his own family appear to have acquiesced in the sentence. Sweyn is represented by the monkish historians as becoming a true penitent. Instead of returning to his old trade of piracy, he assumed the garb of a pilgrim, and went barefoot to Jerusalem, where "he purged himself from all his guilt by weeping, fasting, and prayer," and on his returning through Asia Minor, he died.

Godwin did not long survive his restoration to wealth and power. Some of the old chroniclers associate his death with the murder of Alfred. He was the king's guest at Windsor—the old Windsor of the present day, in which the royal house was then situate—and as they sat together at the banquet, Edward reproached him with being implicated in the murder of his brother Alfred. As he stood up to aver his innocence, it is said that he fell down speechless and died on the spot; but it would rather appear that he was seized with a fit of apoplexy on Easter Monday, and that he lived till the following Thursday, when the great earl gave up the ghost.

Harold succeeded to his father's power and wealth, and at his death was considered by the people the champion of the Saxon cause. Edward, also, looked upon him with greater favour than he had been disposed to show to Godwin. Moreover, the king was at this time bowed down by misfortune and approaching old age, and cared little for earthly dominion, so that Harold in reality became the ruler of the kingdom. The extent of his power soon became manifest. On succeeding to his father's earldom, he had relinquished his own command of East Anglia which was bestowed on Algar, the son of Earl Leofric, who had held it during Harold's banishment. This was not agreeable to Harold, and as soon as he felt he had the power, he procured the banishment of Algar on a charge of treason. Supported, however, by his father-in-law, Griffith, King of Wales, by force of arms Algar obtained a reversal of his outlawry, and was restored to his possessions and honours. Soon after this, his father Leofric died, and he took possession of his vast earldoms; by which his influence became so great that Harold's jealousy again became excited. Algar was again banished, but again, chiefly by the aid of Griffith, he recovered his earldoms and held them, despite the jealousy of Harold and the decrees of Edward against him, which denounced him as a traitor. In a little more than a year, however, Algar died; and his territories and authority were divided between his sons, Edwin and Morcar. Meanwhile, Harold's power became greatly augmented by the death of Siward, Earl of Northumbria, the only other great rival of the Godwin family. Siward had been engaged in Scotland in assisting his relation, Prince Malcolm, to obtain the throne of that country, which had been usurped by Macbeth, the murderer of his father, King Duncan. In a great battle fought at Dunsinane, he lost his favourite son Osberne, and the stricken father returned from Scotland to die. He was attacked by a fatal disorder, and as he felt his end approaching, he directed his attendants to dress him with his coat of mail, to cover his head with his helmet, to put his shield on his left arm and his battle-axe in his right hand, and so "the warlike Siward" died: under arms. The grim old warrior held it to be dishonourable to die in a peaceful bed, nor would he so die. At his death, his youngest son Waltheof was too young to succeed to his father's government, and it was given to Tostig, the brother of Harold. This was an irregular succession, and in itself highly displeasing to the Northumbrians, but it was rendered still more hateful by Tostig's tyrannous rule. At the same time, though his tyranny created great commotions in Northumbria, the people were not unwilling to fight under his banners. As the Welsh at this time showed themselves hostile to England by ravaging its borders, Harold was commissioned, in the year 1063, to chastise them. Aided by Tostig and his Northumbrian followers, he gained a succession of victories in Wales, and the mountaineers were at length reduced to such despair that they slew their king, Griffith, and sent his head to Harold as a peace-offering and token of submission. Hostages were given, and Harold returned in triumph to his sovereign.

Edward the Confessor was now growing old and was childless. For some years he had taken no deep interest in the affairs of government: his time being chiefly spent in ascetic devotions. He was desirous in his old age of undertaking a pilgrimage to Rome, but his Witan objected for a twofold reason: that it was not likely he would survive the fatigues of the journey, and that should he die, the nation would be exposed to the dangers of a disputed succession. There was, however, at that time, a legitimate heir to the throne: Edward, the son of the brave Edmund Ironside, who was still in Hungary. It seems strange that the king and the people should so long have neglected this exiled prince; that Edward especially having no child should not have recalled him to become his successor. His not doing so is an argument in favour of the statement that he designed bequeathing the crown to William of Normandy. But if such was the case, he dared not openly avow it, for although he had been indulged in his desire of retaining a few of his Norman bishops, abbots, and chaplains, to assist him in his devotions, the nation would have revolted at the proposition of having a Norman king to rule over them. His Witan, indeed, pressed him to send for his nephew Edward, and a formal embassy was sent to Henry III., Emperor of Germany, requesting he might be restored to the English nation. Edward had married a relative of that emperor, and he came to England with his wife and three young children—Edgar, Margaret, and Christina—and was warmly

welcomed by the people. On the part of the king, however, there was still cold neglect. Although Edward was recalled from his exile for the express purpose of being named his successor, he was never even admitted into his presence: a circumstance on which history throws no clear light. It may have been that the king was not sincere in his intention to nominate him as his successor, or that Harold prevented any intercourse between them for his own ambitious designs. As indeed, Edward the Atheling, or the Outlaw, died shortly after in London, it is supposed by some writers that Harold not only kept him from the court of his uncle, but that he caused him to be poisoned, in order to remove what he considered the greatest, if not the only obstacle, that lay in his way to the throne of England. That Harold was ambitious of becoming king, there can be but little doubt, but there is no proof that he was guilty of the death of Edward. It is not even clear that he was murdered; and if he was, the crime might with as much show of reason, be imputed to William, Duke of Normandy, for he had his emissaries and partisans in England, and he too was ambitious, at the death of the reigning monarch, of becoming king over the English.

Edward Atheling left an infant son Edgar, but as he was not only young but feeble in body and of weak intellect, no one looked upon him as their future sovereign. The two competitors for the throne, therefore, were Harold, the brother of the queen, and William, Duke of Normandy. Harold was looked upon by the Saxons as the most national successor to the throne; but it would appear that Edward now, if he had not before, fixed his thoughts on his cousin William. According to some Norman chroniclers, Edward made a will to that effect, and Harold was sent into Normandy to convey the intelligence of that will to the Norman duke. It is not likely, however, that Harold would have undertaken such a mission. That in the year 1065, he went to Normandy is an historical fact, but that he went on such an errand demands a doubt. Whether, indeed, he went to Normandy on any mission may be questioned. When Earl Godwin was restored to his honours and estates, he had given hostages to Edward, as pledges of his future fidelity. These hostages—his youngest son Wulnoth, and his grandson Haco—had been sent to William of Normandy for safe custody, and it is said that, as Edward was now willing they should be restored, Harold's object in going to that country was to obtain their release. Another and a more probable account is that he was an unwilling visitor: more probable, as he would scarcely be willing to place himself in the power of an unscrupulous rival. As the story is told, Harold one day embarked for recreation in a fishing-boat, taking with him only a few attendants, and was driven by a storm on the coasts of Normandy. He was wrecked or stranded near the mouth of the Somme, in the territory of Guy, Count of Poitou. As was usual in the middle ages, Guy seized the wreck as his right. He appropriated to himself Harold's equipments, his armour, his jewels, his embroidered mantles, and what gold he and his attendants possessed, without compunction. But even this did not satisfy Guy's rapacity. He shut them up in a fortress near Montreuil, and swore t would not release them without a ransom. extremity, Harold applied to the Norman d assistance, and William commanded Guy to se immediately to his court at Rouen: at the sa offering to pay him a princely ransom. Guy co and Harold was sent to his rival's court at where he was treated with the most lavish gen The rivals became in appearance the warn friends. Had Harold been his twin brother, could not have treated him with greater hosp There was no end of feasting and pageant William made his guest splendid gifts of ar horses. While at Rouen it does appear that solicited the release of his father's hostag this story relates that William promised to in the frankest manner possible. But in a seeming friendship, William had an end in The story goes on to say that one day in tall England, he said that when he and Edwar living under the same roof in Normandy, Edwa told him that if ever he should be King of E he, William, should be his successor. Would he asked, support him in his pretensions English throne? It was a plain, straightf question: how was Harold to answer it? He his rival's power, and if he said, "No," he kn well what would be the result. He therefore as But a simple assent was not sufficient. He swear, and he took the oath, but it was with a reservation. But on what did he take that fata Before a grand council of the barons and chief Normandy he swore, as he thought upon c reliquaries, such as the priests in England their altars to command the faith of the Sax santry; but having taken the oath, the cloth c on which those reliquaries were placed, at th mand of William, was removed, and there, neath, lay the bones of saints and holy martyrs! imbued with the superstition of the age, it that Harold turned pale; but the oath was tak

THE CROWN OFFERED TO HAROLD BY THE PEOPLE. BAYEUX TAPESTRY.

it could not be recalled. Such is this story of Harold's visit to Normandy; and, as it is in perfect accordance with the character of the age in which these rivals lived, it may be true. It seems, indeed, confirmed by the Bayeux Tapestry, which contains the whole history of the Norman conquest of England, from the departure of Harold in his fishing-boat, to the rout of the Saxons in the decisive battle of Hastings.

NORMANS PREPARING FOR BATTLE.—BAYEUX TAPESTRY.

Whether Harold went to Normandy on any mission, or whether he was tossed on its coasts by a storm, is a matter of little moment: one thing is clear, however, that his sojourn at the court of Rouen was fatal to his future interests. It is true that he was no sooner out of the power of William, than he disregarded his promises and oaths, and proceeded with redoubled ardour to secure his own succession to the throne of England; but that fatal oath had not only robbed him of future freedom of action, but it had armed his rival with a power which, in that dark age, was all potent.

On his arrival in England, Harold was called upon to quell an insurrection, induced by his brother's tyranny, in Northumbria. There was a general rising against his authority. The Northumbrians, enraged at his cruelty and oppression, had marched against York, where Tostig resided, and had massacred two hundred of his body guards, seized his treasures, and had driven him out of the country. Having expelled their governor, the Northumbrians chose Morcar, one of the sons of Earl Algar, for their earl, and he not only took possession of the earldom, but at the head of the insurgents and some Welsh auxiliaries advanced to Northampton, designing to extend his power southwards. Tostig had repaired to the court of Edward to complain of the injuries he had received, and Harold was commissioned to restore him to his government and punish the insurgents. The two armies met near Northampton, but before the sword was drawn, there was a conference, in which Harold was convinced of the justice of the cause of the Northumbrians. He was so satisfied with the truth of the representations made of his brother's cruelties and oppressions, that he abandoned his cause, and prevailed with the king to pardon the insurgents and confirm Morcar in his earldom. Despairing of his restoration to his government, Tostig now retired to the court of his father-in-law, Baldwin, Earl of Flanders, and enraged with his brother Harold, from that time he became his most implacable enemy. Tostig, indeed, opened a correspondence with his brother's rival, William of Normandy. As a counterbalance to this adverse circumstance, however, Harold procured the government of Mercia for Earl Morcar's brother Edwin, and married their sister Editha, by which prudent policy, he attached these two powerful earls to his interests.

SEAL OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR

Meanwhile, Edward the Confessor had been gradually declining towards the grave. He had been for some years erecting the abbey church of Westminster, and his one desire was to see it completed. That desire was fulfilled. His favourite place of abode was the palace of Westminster, close by the abbey, and here, on the 5th of January, A.D. 1066, he breathed his last: after uttering ravings full of terror and superstition, which some of those around him interpreted as predictions of the evils which were coming upon the land. Coming events had cast their shadows before, and old and feeble as Edward was in body and intellect, he could not be ignorant of what would happen, so soon as he was laid in the cold and silent tomb. In truth, he had, by his own vacillating conduct concerning a successor, laid the foundations of the miseries which were at the time of his death impending over the land. He was buried within the walls of the sacred edifice he had just lived to complete.

Harold.—Chroniclers, in the interest of William Duke of Normandy, assert that Edward, in his dying moments, repeated the clauses of his will, and named him as his successor; while others, in the interest of Harold, affirm that he told the chiefs and churchmen around him that no one was so worthy of the crown as the great son of Godwin. But the will or wish of the dying monarch, whatever it may have been, was beside the question. In a great measure, the English crown was at that period elective. Previous successions show great irregularities. Sometimes the brother of a deceased monarch superseded all his sons, while at others the younger son was placed over the eldest. At this time, however, the royal race of Edward was extinct—except in the life of an imbecile boy—and it became imperative to look for a king elsewhere. The choice was clearly left to the nation. The question to be decided was, whether William of Normandy, Edward's second cousin, or Harold, the defender of the Saxon cause and Edward's near relative by marriage, should reign over the Saxon people. The Witan decided. It was to be Harold; and accordingly, on the very day of the burial of the deceased monarch, *he*, the elected of the people, was crowned by Stigand, the Saxon Archbishop of Canterbury.

The accession of Harold was hailed with joy by the country: especially in the southern counties of England. He commenced his reign by many acts well calculated to sustain his popularity. He abolished or diminished many grievous taxes, and his administration is acknowledged to have been wise, just, and courteous. As he was aware of the bitter resentment of his brother Tostig, and the power and ambition of his rival William, one of his first cares was to provide a fleet for the defence of the country, and an army which would be able to cope with his enemies. In the midst of all this, however, the minds of many became a prey to superstitious apprehensions. Some had risen superior to the terror of dead men's bones and the oaths that had been exacted most foully from Harold while in Normandy; but there were others, and especially the ecclesiastics, who trembled for the consequences of the non-observance of that fatal compact. Their fears were heightened by a three-tailed comet, which is said to have blazed in the nightly sky throughout this memorable month of January. "Thou art come!" writes William of Malmesbury, "Thou art come! a matter of great lamentation to many a mother art thou come! I have seen thee long before; but now I behold thee in thy terrors, threatening destruction to this country." If it did appear, the three-tailed comet, blaze nightly as it might, had no significance; but there *was* real cause for fear, for it was not probable that William, whose heart was fixed upon obtaining the throne of England, would, under such circumstances, give up that throne without a struggle for the prize.

In January, A.D. 1066, William was at Rouen. One day he was hunting in the forest of Rouvray, and, while trying the power of a new bow, a messenger, sent by his Norman friends in England, came to tell him of his cousin's death and Harold's succession. Throwing down his bow, he hastily recrossed the Seine, and strode into his palace. His face was flushed with wrath. He clenched his teeth, stalked up and down the hall, and half drew his sword from its scabbard. There was a terrible commotion in his ambitious breast. He had expected to reign in England, and another king—and Harold, too—was elected to that throne by the Witan. Harold, who had sworn by dead men's bones that he would support his own accession: was such infamy to be endured? No! He must, he would have the throne of England, if not by peaceable means, yet by the sword. But before he drew that sword William adopted measures to insure success. Envoys were sent to Rome to solicit the aid of Nicholas II., by putting England under an interdict. It had chosen a perjuror for its king; and an archbishop, who had never been acknowledged by the Papal power, had placed the crown upon that perjuror's head. Moreover, England had committed a crime which could never be passed over by a Pope of Rome: it had ceased to pay the Peter's pence, which long time had been willingly poured into the Papal treasury. Nicholas complied with William's request: the thunders of interdict, at which, in that dark age, all Christendom trembled, were hurled against England. Rome, therefore, declared itself in favour of the claims of William. But it was not so with Philip of France, or Baldwin of Flanders: when applied to for aid, they declined to assist him in the enterprise. Even among his own people William met with no little opposition; for, at a great council held at Lillebonne, after a stormy debate, the warriors, churchmen, and burghers present, declared that while they would cheerfully defend their own country, they would not aid him in a foreign conquest. But William soon discovered the means of enlisting their services. He gave them gold, and held out to them a rich harvest of honours and rewards; and, at length, when he issued a proclamation that the Pope had sent him a consecrated banner under which to fight for the crown of England, there was no lack of soldiers willing to fight for his cause. Adventurers flocked to his standard from all western Europe: Normans, Bretons, Poitevins, Burgundians, and others, all became eager for the broad lands, and the gold and the Saxon heiresses of England.

It was nearly autumn before William's prepara-

tions were completed. While making them, he had sent ambassadors to denounce Harold as a perjuror, and to require him to give up the throne which he had usurped; but he replied, with firmness, that his oath was both unlawful and involuntary, and therefore not binding, and that he was determined to defend the throne to which he had been raised by the unanimous voice of the nobles, the clergy, and the people. Both sides, therefore, prepared for war. In August, a fleet of nearly a thousand ships was assembled at the mouth of the Dive for the invasion of England. It was detained for a month by contrary winds; but, at length, a breeze from the west carried it from the Dive to the mouth of the Somme, not far from Dieppe. Contrary winds again prevailed, but, at length, on the 27th of September, this great fleet weighed anchor; the vessel in which William sailed leading the way.

Vigorous measures had been adopted by Harold for the defence of his kingdom. At the head of a large army he had, during the summer, been carefully watching the southern coast; and as the season advanced, it was thought that the attack would be deferred till the ensuing spring. The crisis, however, arrived before winter, and in a more fearful shape than had been anticipated. Tostig, his unnatural brother, had no sooner heard of Harold's elevation to the throne of England, than he hastened to William, Duke of Normandy, who had married Matilda, his wife's sister, to concert measures with him against their common enemy. Impatient of delay, Tostig collected a small fleet with which he sailed towards England about the beginning of May, and attempted to make descents on several parts of the coast, but was everywhere repulsed with loss. Finding his efforts useless, he retired into Scotland in the hope of obtaining aid from Malcolm, its king; but Malcolm declined to espouse his quarrel. He was, however, more successful with Harold Hadrada, king of Norway. That monarch engaged to invade England with his whole force; and early in September, he approached the Northumbrian coast with a fleet of three hundred ships, and was joined by Tostig with his fleet from Scotland. After burning Scarborough, they sailed to the Humber, and rounding the point of Holderness, entered it, where they landed their forces and advanced towards York. They were encountered near that city by the two earls, Edwin and Morcar, and a bloody battle was fought, in which victory long remained doubtful; but, at length, the earls were defeated, and shut themselves up in York, which was closely besieged. News of this danger, drew Harold from the south, and by forced marches he arrived in time to save the city. Harold would have treated with his brother Tostig. He offered him peace, friendship, and the restoration of his honours; but he wished to know what the king of Norway should have. "Seven feet for a grave!" was the stern reply. A battle was fought at Stamford Bridge on the Derwent, on the 25th of September, and Tostig and his ally both perished in the carnage: a carnage so fearful, that it is said to have whitened the earth with dead men's bones for half a century.

It was four days after this battle that William landed in Pevensey Bay, which at that time was covered by the sea, and made a much nearer approach to the chalk hills than at the present day. Harold was sitting at a banquet in York, when he heard of the landing of the Normans. Before he marched northwards, he had made preparations for a resistance by sea; but the winds that had detained the Norman invaders had kept his ships in port till it was too late to encounter the enemy. The Norman troops, therefore, landed without difficulty: first the archers, then the knights, with their esquires and horses; then the artisans with material for fortifications; and last of all, Duke William. On receiving this intelligence, Harold marched to London, and Saxon warriors from all quarters, except the north, came flocking to his standard. Having manned seven hundred vessels, he sent them round the coast to prevent William's escape; for, flushed with recent victory, he felt confident that he should vanquish the Normans. But Harold was too impatient to meet his rival. In his recent battle at Stamford Bridge, he had lost many of his bravest warriors, and time was required to fill up his ranks. If he had waited a few days, his army, which was hourly increasing, would have been superior to that of the enemy; but as it was, he set out from London with a force far inferior to that of the Norman duke. His hope was, that he might profit by a sudden and unexpected attack; and, contrary to the sage advice of his brother Gurth and his wisest counsellors, he made a rapid march towards Hastings. His hope of a surprise was fallacious. William was too cautious a general to be thus overtaken. His camp was well guarded, and advanced posts were thrown out to prevent surprise. At Harold's approach, those posts, which consisted of good cavalry, fell back, and William was thus warned of his danger. Harold himself discovered by spies sent forward that the position of the Norman army was too formidable to be madly attacked; and therefore he halted at Senlac, since called Battle, where, surrounding his camp with ditches and palisades, he awaited the attack of his rival.

It would appear that while thus encamped within sight of each other, some fruitless negotiations were entered into between Harold and William. It is related that the Norman duke offered to Harold's acceptance one of these three things; either to resign his crown, or to submit to the arbitration of the Pope, or decide the quarrel by single combat. We can hardly suppose that these propositions were ever made. William certainly could not expect Harold to resign that which it had been the ambition of his life to obtain, and as for submitting the quarrel to the arbitration of the Pope, that was idle, for it was well known that Nicholas, in the hope of advancing the interests of the church, had sent him a consecrated banner under which to fight for the throne of England, and that, therefore, he would have decided in his favour. The third proposition is more probable, because examples of offers to decide claims to the thrones by single combat at this period of the world's history is not uncommon; but there is no record that any such overture was ever accepted. Then again it is recorded that when Harold rejected these threefold propositions, William sent his envoy charged with a message to this effect, that if Harold would keep his old bargain

with him—that is, if he would respect the oath which he had been inveigled to take on the relics of saints and martyrs, on dead men's bones—he would leave him all the country beyond the Humber, and give his brother Gurth all the lands of his father Godwin. The envoy was to add if this proposition was refused, a defiance to this effect: he was to tell Harold that he was a perjuror and a liar, and that he and all his supporters were excommunicated by the Pope, and that he had with him a bull to prove the fact. The Norman chronicle states that as the envoy, who was a monk, spoke of excommunication, which he did in a very solemn tone, the English chiefs gazed upon each other in dismay; but it may be suspected that all these stories are as genuine as those found in the mendacious pages of the Roman historian Livy. William was clearly resolved to possess the whole kingdom. He had in truth promised its lands to his nobles, captains, and knights — even the meanest among his followers was to be a gentleman—and they had done homage to him for their broad acres in perspective. The story, also, of the Normans having spent the night preceding the battle in silence and in prayer, while the English spent it in revelry, may also be questioned as to its veracity. The Normans



FEASTING OF THE NORMANS AT HASTINGS.

certainly were not more devout than the Saxons. At the same time it seems clear that there were cooler preparation on the side of William than there was on that of Harold. At the dawn of the memomorable day which was to give a new dynasty to Saxon England—the 14th of October—mass was celebrated among the Normans, by Odo, bishop of Bayeux, half brother of William. This, however, was according to the superstition of the age, and not a sign of more than ordinary piety among the Norman warriors. They were no soldiers of the cross like the Crusaders; nor were they inspired with fanaticism like the Ironsides of Cromwell. Led by an ambitious chief, they were themselves ambitious, and religious devotion and ambition are incompatible. Even Odo, the b displayed more of the warrior than the divine had in Normandy advocated the enterprise fro pulpit; had joined the fleet with a band of m arms; and had been one of the first to leap on at Pevensey. On the day of battle, indeed, he mo a white charger, and was everywhere seen i thickest of the fight; sinking the monk int bloodthirsty trooper.

The hour of battle came. The forces of Wi were divided into three columns; the first com of archers and slingers; the second, of heavy-a infantry; and the third, of cavalry, headed b duke in person. Around the neck of William chroniclers relate, were suspended some of relics upon which Harold had sworn at Rouen; at his side was one Toustain, surnamed "The W or "The Fair," who carried the standard bless Pope Nicholas. Harold's troops were all on they were armed with swords, spears, and battle and were formed into one deep and compact bod the centre of which, on a rising ground, wave Saxon standard, around which stood Harold an two brothers, Gurth and Leofwin. The Nor were the assailants. They had now done with pr for, as they advanced, they sang the famous battle of Roland. Some authorities, however, state tha Normans shouted "God is our help!" while the S vociferated "The holy cross!" The fight comm with a flight of arrows from the Norman bowm mode of fighting which in after years became most effective tactics of the English themselves was, indeed, by the arrow that the Normans obt this victory. But it was not till after one o most deadly struggles recorded in the page of his For six long hours success was evenly balanced. Normans with their bows and lances charged charged again, but were each time repulsed by battle-axe of the English. Like a mighty wall kept their ground: so solid and compact were masses. At one time their line was broken b Norman cavalry, but it was only for a moment: rallied, and their assailants were driven back slain in heaps. The ponderous battle-axe cut thr the coats of mail worn by the Norman knigh though they had been made of wood, and not of or iron. In the midst of the confusion that ensued, a cry was raised that William was slain a flight commenced, but he reappeared on his horse and restored order. But so long as Ha troops remained unbroken, he had no hope of vic But what could be done? The bow and the had in vain been employed in breaking that soli One only chance remained; and that was to breal Anglo-Saxon lines by stratagem. Again the ca charged, and feigning a retreat, the English left positions to follow them, and were surprised in dis and assailed on every side by sword and lance. stratagem was repeated, and with the same fatal re in another part of the field: many hundred Harold's forces perished. The main body of English, however, retained its position behind stakes and palisades on the ridge of the emi on which it was posted. A third time, the strat was tried, and was this time attended with still

fatal results: the English being thrown into disorder, the Norman horse and foot entered the enclosure, and broke through the line in several points. The victory, however, was still undecided: the remains of Harold's broken phalanx closed around him and defied all the power of the Normans. They seemed invincible, but as a last effort, William commanded his archers to point their arrows upward that they might fall upon the heads of the English. The device succeeded. One of those random arrows pierced Harold's left-eye and penetrated his brain: he dropped in agony. It was now that the English first gave way. But they did not yet take refuge in flight. Retreating to their standard, they rallied round it and defended it with the utmost bravery, and it was not till Gurth and Leofwin had perished that the standard of the Saxon army was captured. Then all hope fled. Broken and dispirited, the remnant of that brave host dispersed through a wood in their rear, and many a Norman, who followed them by the light of the moon, was hewn down by the battle-axes of the fugitives.

ORDERS GIVEN FOR ERECTION OF CAMP AT HASTINGS.

William had gained the victory, but it was at the expense of one fourth of his army. It is recorded that fifteen thousand Normans fell on that fatal day: finding a grave in the soil which they came to enjoy as an estate. The loss of the English was still greater, but the country was not yet wholly conquered. On the contrary, for seven long years William's wars for the conquest of the west, north, and east, were protracted, during which many more of his Norman followers found graves where they had hoped to reap honours and rewards. But in effect the crown of England was won, and William's ambition was satisfied. As for the brave Harold, his body, it is said, remained unrecognised among the slain till it was discovered by his widowed queen, Editha. His remains received honourable interment in the Abbey of Waltham.

"In Waltham Abbey on St. Agnes' eve
A stately corpse lay stretched upon a bier;
The arms were crossed upon the breast: the face,
Uncovered by the tapers' trembling light,
Showed dimly the pale majesty severe
Of him whom Death and not the Norman Duke
Had conquered: him the noblest and the last
Of Saxon kings—save one the noblest he—
The last of all."—*Wordsworth.*

The history of the civil and military affairs of Wales and Scotland, during this period, is still fragmentary and uncertain.

At its commencement, A.D. 978, Owen Howel Dha was Prince of South Wales, and Howel Iwaf of North Wales. Howel Iwaf was slain in making an incursion into England A.D. 984, and was succeeded in his principality by Cadwallon his brother. Cadwallon, however, did not long enjoy his principality. He was slain in the year 985 by Meredyth ap Owen, the son of Owen Howel, Prince of South Wales; and Owen Howel, dying two years after Meredyth, ruled over both principalities. The reign of Meredyth, who is represented as an usurper, appears to have been marked with war and confusion. Taking advantage of the intestine broils which prevailed, the Danes invaded the principalities and obliged Meredyth to pay tribute: "a penny for every man in Wales." Meredyth died A.D. 998, leaving no male issue, but only a daughter, who married Llhewelyn, a nobleman who was descended by his mother from the ancient princes of North Wales. At the death of Meredyth, however, that principality after long contentions fell into the hands of an obscure adventurer named Aedan, who retained possession of it from the year 1003 to A.D. 1015, when he was slain in battle by Llhewelyn. It is related that Wales enjoyed great prosperity under this prince: the earth bringing forth double; the people prospering in all their affairs and multiplying wonderfully; and the cattle increasing greatly. "There was neither beggar nor poor man from the south to the north sea." Llhewelyn was slain in battle, A.D. 1021, by Howel ap Edwin the right heir of the principality of South Wales, and though he left a son named Gryffyth, he was succeeded in the northern principality by its rightful heir, Iago ap Edwal. When his father died, Gryffyth was very young, but on arriving at the age of manhood, in the year 1037, he defeated and killed Iago in battle, and obtained possession of the principality. Soon after, indeed, he expelled Howel from South Wales, and once more reunited the two principalities under one rule. Gryffyth was one of the most warlike princes that ever reigned in Wales. He not only defended his own country but made frequent incursions into England. His inroads became so destructive that, as before recorded, Harold led his forces into Wales and reduced the Welsh to such despair that they sent him the head of the brave Gryffyth as a token of their submission. After his death the Welsh yielded the nomination of their princes to Edward the Confessor: Blethyn and Rywalhan were appointed princes or governors of North Wales, and Meredyth ap Owen prince of South Wales; and these were princes of Wales when William duke of Normandy landed in England, A.D. 1066.

Kenneth II. of Scotland, who died, as stated in the previous section, A.D. 994, left a son named Malcolm who was Prince of Cumberland, but he was succeeded

in his kingdom by Constantine, the son of his immediate predecessor, Culen. This was a common custom at that period; but it occasioned a civil war between Malcolm and Constantine, in which the latter was slain in the year 966. Malcolm, however, did not profit by his victory, for another competitor appeared in the person of Grime, the son of the late King Duff, who won the crown. Gathering together the scattered remains of Constantine's army, Grime hastened to Scone, and was there acknowledged king of Scotland. Civil war ensued, which threatened the country with destruction, but a peace was finally brought about by the good offices of a bishop named Fothad, in which it was agreed that Grime should enjoy the kingdom for his life, and that Malcolm should succeed him; and that thenceforth the succession should be hereditary; that is, a father should be succeeded by his son, and not by his nephew, as had hitherto generally been the custom. Malcolm, however, was still impatient to reign, for at the end of eight years he drew the sword again, and Grime, being mortally wounded in a battle fought on Ascension-day, A.D. 1004, he ascended the throne with the consent of all parties. While Prince of Cumberland, Malcolm had refused to pay danegeld to the piratical Danes, and when he ascended the throne of Scotland, they invaded his kingdom, and, at one time, obtained a settlement in the countries of Moray and Buchan; but they were finally driven out of the kingdom. Fordun, and others, relate that Malcolm gave his nobles all his crown lands as a reward for their bravery in his wars with the Danes, reserving no property to himself, or his successors, except the Mute hill of Scone; but these same chroniclers relate that he and his successors subsequently built monasteries, and erected bishopricks which they endowed with many lands. According to Fordun, Malcolm, whose administration was long held in grateful remembrance, was slain by conspirators in the castle of Glamis, A.D. 1034.

The change in the old rule of succession was of little moment to Malcolm, for he left no son. He had, however, a grandson, named Duncan, the son of his daughter Beatrice, who was married to Crinon, abbot of Dunkeld. Duncan, who had been Prince of Cumberland, succeeded to the throne. Of the events of this reign, very little is known. Some of the old chroniclers relate that its commencement was marked by an insurrection, and that subsequently, Scotland was invaded by Sweyn, King of Denmark, who defeated Duncan in a bloody battle near Culross; after which, while negotiating terms of peace, the Scots sent provisions and drugged liquors to the Norwegian army, of which Sweyn and his followers drank so deeply, that they became intoxicated, and an easy prey to the Scots, who, rallying out from Perth, in which they had taken refuge, cut nearly all their enemies to pieces, Sweyn himself with some of his attendants escaping with difficulty. There appears to be no truth in this story; and the chief interest attached to the reign of Duncan is the manner in which his death was encompassed, that event being made the subject-matter of one of Shakspere's wonderful dramas. In order to secure the accession of Duncan, King Malcolm is said to have put away the only existing male descendant of Grime, called by some writers Kenneth the Grim—which descendant stood in the same relationship to him as Duncan did to Malcolm, that of grandson. He was the son of Grime's son Boidhe, and by putting him away, Malcolm conceived that he should secure the succession to his own family. Boidhe, however, had left a daughter named Gruoch, who had deep wrongs to avenge. She had not only the death of a father and a brother to avenge, but of her first husband, Gilcomcain, chief of Moray, who having been defeated in an attempt to support the cause of his wife's family against the power of Malcolm, had been burnt in his castle with many of his followers. The Lady Gruoch fled with an infant son to Ross, of which Macbeth appears to have been a chieftain. The Lady Gruoch became the Lady Macbeth, and both appear to have acquiesced in the accession of Duncan, and to have courted his friendship. But their design in all their seeming friendship was to rid Duncan of his crown and his life, for in the year 1040, he was, while their guest, barbarously assassinated, and Macbeth ascended his throne.

Duncan left two sons, Malcolm, Prince of Cumberland, and Donald Bane. On hearing of their father's death, they raised some forces, to avenge his murder, and assert their rights, but they were unsuccessful: Malcolm retired into his principality, and Donald to the Western Isles. During the first ten years of his reign Macbeth is represented as ruling wisely and justly; protecting his subjects from the lawless violence of robbers, and the oppressions of the Scottish nobles. It would appear, however, that he did not rule in peace, for several revolts occurred during that period in favour of Malcolm. It may have been from this cause that he eventually departed from a wise and just course of government, and became a suspicious and cruel tyrant. He stands charged with plotting the death of Bancho, thane of Lochaber, who had been the chief instrument of raising him to the throne, and of whom he had become jealous. At the death of Bancho, several Scottish nobles who were secretly in the interests of Malcolm, resorted to his court in Cumberland. Among these fugitives was Macduff, chief of Fife. Macduff fled in such haste, that he left his wife and children behind him, who were all put to death by Macbeth. Macduff entreated Malcolm to raise an army to invade Scotland; and joined by Siward, the famous Earl of Northumberland, whose wife was the sister of Duncan, in the year 1054, their combined forces marched against Macbeth. It was in this war that Siward lost his favourite son, as before recorded. The contest was long and bloody, for Macbeth was brave and warlike; and tyrant as he is represented to have been, he had brave and faithful supporters. There is much confusion in the accounts of this contest; for while some writers represent that the first encounter took place near Dunsinane, and that he protracted the war for two years longer in his mountain fastnesses, others say that the battle of Dunsinane was the last fought, and that it was decisive. Be that as it may, Macbeth fell in battle, A.D. 1057: struck down, as all writers agree, by the hand of Macduff. But the fate of Macbeth, did not end the contest. His followers set up the son of the Lady Macbeth, Lulach, as their king, and who,

as a descendant from Duff, the eldest son of Malcolm I., had as good, if not a better right to the throne than his rival, who was descended from Malcolm's youngest son, Kenneth III. But Lulach was a fugitive rather than a king, for all the while he bore that title he was chased from place to place by his rival's forces, and in a few weeks was overtaken and slain in battle. At his death all Scotland submitted to Malcolm III., who was crowned at Scone; and who was still king when William the Conqueror came into England.

CHAPTER II.

The History of Laws and Government, from the Arrival of the Saxons, A.D. 449, to the Landing of William Duke of Normandy, A.D. 1066.

SECTION I.

The history of the constitution, and form of government established, and of the laws which were enacted by the Anglo-Saxons in this period, is fraught with the deepest interest; inasmuch as that form of government and those laws form the ground-work of our present free and happy constitution. The Saxon annals, however, so imperfectly display the origin and progress of the goodly fabric which they planted on the ruins of the Roman military despotism, that it would be impossible to write a history thereof, so as to leave nothing to be desired. We shall, however, endeavour to lay before our readers such a view of it as will prove that the English constitution, under whose wide-spreading branches we live in peace and security, is derived from the Saxon mind.

It was not a military despotism which the Saxons brought with them into our island. The Germanic nations of which they formed a part, like all northern nations, were a fierce, free, and independent people, and wherever they established themselves on the ruins of Rome, they introduced free governments. As Hume rightly observes:—"The free constitutions then established, however, impaired by the encroachments of succeeding princes, still preserve an air of independence and legal administration, which distinguish the European nations; and if that part of the globe maintain sentiments of liberty, honour, equity, and valour superior to the rest of mankind, it owes these advantages chiefly to the seeds implanted by these generous barbarians."

The Anglo-Saxon Kings.—The first kings of the Saxons in England were merely chiefs: leaders appointed, or rather elected by lot from among a number of chieftains, to hold the chief command until the war was over, when they again descended to their original position. As, however, the war in Britain was of long continuance, the office of cyning, or king, became permanent. It was, therefore, the rule of a military chief, elected in time of war, which gave birth to the regal office among our ancestors. At the same time, the Anglo-Saxon kings possessed only the shadow, and not the substance of imperial sovereignty. They were limited, not absolute monarchs. They ruled, but it was "by the grace of God," and with the advice and consent of the great men of the nation: "the wise elders of the people, and a large associated number of the ministers of God." They did not even ascend the throne by hereditary right, but were elected from the royal house by the Witan, or great council of the nation; or, as it sometimes happened, by a more extended suffrage. Their subjects were bound to them, by an oath of fealty; but at their coronation they contracted a corresponding obligation to their subjects. Thus, when Ethelred II. was crowned by Dunstan, at Kingston, he took this solemn oath before the altar:—

"In the name of the Holy Trinity, three things do I promise to this Christian people, my subjects; first, that I will hold God's Church and all the Christian people of my realm in true peace; second, that I will forbid all rapine and injustice to men of all conditions; third, that I promise and enjoin justice and mercy in all judgments whereby the just and merciful God may give us all his eternal favour, who liveth and reigneth." Their very laws were not made by them alone, but in concert with the national assembly, which was called the Witenagemot; so that, although they possessed considerable privileges and powers, they were only supreme chiefs among other rulers, and not such monarchs as now rule over Europe. Supported by the pontiffs of Rome, their authority gradually increased, but it varied with their personal characters, and down to the latest period they were assisted in their government and legislation by the national assembly.

Among the branches of the royal prerogative were the summoning and prorogation of the Witan; the appointment of ealdormen and sheriffs; the superintendance of the coinage; purveyance or providing for himself and officers, by a claim of harbourage and provisions in royal progresses in certain places, chiefly the monastic houses; and a right to property in forests, treasure trove, mines, and wrecks. The Crown possessed extensive domains, manors, and woods, which formed, with other privileges, an ample patrimony for the sovereign: a patrimony, indeed, often employed in the corruption of the subject, or became so diminished by prodigality as to give rise to the necessity of aids and benevolences to free the Crown from debt.

The Witenagemot.—Although our knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon history and antiquities is too imperfect to admit of a clear delineation of the government at this period, it is certain that there existed at all times a national council called a Witenagemot; or literally, "an assembly of wise men." During the Heptarchy, there were as many sub-assemblies as there were kingdoms; but after the union of these kingdoms into one monarchy, they were all united into one great council: just as there is one parliament only

for the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Who were the constituent members of this assembly has not been determined by antiquaries with accuracy; but the best account is that which is given by Sir Francis Palgrave. That acute writer observes: "In the smaller kingdoms, such as Kent, the Witenagemot did not probably differ materially from the Shiremoot which assembled on Penenden Heath in subsequent times. The prelates appear in the first order of the community. The seniors, earls or aldermen, are convened not only in the character of chieftains, but also by virtue of the bond of trust which connected them with their sovereign. The thanes gave suit and service as principal landlords; and the ceorls attending for the townships listen to the promulgation of the decree, declare their grievances, and *present* the trespasses committed in the communities to which they belong. The actual appearance of the foregoing classes is not a matter of hypothesis, but of evidence: the document lies before us in which they address their sovereign; and with respect to the functions exercised by the ceorls, the testimony of the Anglo-Saxon laws receives the fullest corroboration from the universal usage of subsequent times. In the earlier periods, a dependent or vassal kingdom retained its own legislature, sitting and acting distinct from the legislature of the paramount kingdom. But the Witenagemot, convened by the Basileus, was the general Diet or Placitum of the empire. Here the King of Albion appeared, wearing his crown and surrounded by his great officers of state. The prelates concurred in the enactments. The vassal kings, the



GOLDEN CROSS OF ST. CUTHBERT.

rulers of the Cymric and Celtic tribes, testified their obedience. The earls, and ealdormen, and thanes, whether of Anglo-Saxon race or the Northmen, settled in the Danelagh, completed the assembly, which comprehended all the councillors and sages, redesmen and witan, both clerks and laymen, whose advice and assistance the sovereign was entitled to demand." It seems clear that all the considerable proprietors of land, or thanes, who were warriors or descendants of warriors, together with the hierarchy, ealdormen, and domesmen or judges, were members of the Witenagemot; but is not equally clear, as some have endeavoured to prove, that small proprietors of land, or the inhabitants of trading towns, had their representatives. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the people were not represented in that assembly: that the great men of the nation were too jealous of power to admit any from inferior ranks, whether small landowners or burgesses, to share with them in the legislative authority.

Classes of Society.—The Anglo-Saxon population were divided into various classes, or castes, the highest of which was that out of which their kings were elected; a race claiming to be descendants of the deified monarch of the Asi, Odin, or Woden. Next in order to that of the Saxon monarchs was that of the nobles, or thanes, a caste divided into two sections, namely, the king's thanes and the lesser thanes; the latter of whom appear to have been dependent on the former, receiving lands from them for which they paid rent, services, or attendance in peace and war. The relative dignity of these two classes of thanes was measured by the value at which life was rated, as expressed in the legal composition for manslaughter. Thus the life of the higher order was valued at twelve hundred, and of the lower at six hundred shillings; while the fine fixed for that of an ordinary freeman was only one-third of the latter amount. The entire executive government was in the hands of this Saxon aristocracy. Next in rank to the king was the ealdorman, who was the sub-governor of district, shire, or several counties, a dignity answering to the modern lord-lieutenant. The ealdorman had the judicial administration and military force under his control: it was his to see that justice was duly administered within his province, and to call out the military in times of danger. The dignity of ealdorman, like that of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, was not hereditary, although it occasionally descended from father to son. It has been seen, indeed, in the case of Harold's brother Tostig, that an ealdorman was appointed and was removable by the king. It was from the higher aristocracy—the king's thanes—that all the chief officers, both civil and military, were taken, they being the chief landowners. If a person of noble birth did not possess sufficient land—probably forty hydes, or between four or five thousand acres—to constitute a lordship, he attached himself to one who had that qualification, to whom he became bound by fealty, and from whom he might claim legal protection. The number of the Saxon aristocracy was swelled by the clergy, all of whom, from the archbishop to the deacon, took rank with them. The next class or rank of people were the ceorls—freemen who were generally cultivators of the soil under the protection of a thane. Ceorl was the most common name for a husbandman among the Anglo-Saxons. In general, they seem to have been a kind of gentlemen farmers, and if any of them so prospered as to acquire land to the extent of five hydes, upon which he had a church, a kitchen, a bell-house, and a great gate, he obtained a seat and office in the king's court and acquired the dignity of thaneship. It does not appear, however, to have been very desirable to acquire riches and dignity at that period, for whoever

did became the object of envy and oppression by the nobles. It is related, indeed, that those who thus raised themselves from the middle ranks, could only obtain security by courting the patronage of some great chieftain, and by paying a considerable sum for his safety. There was a law passed in the reign of Athelstan legalizing the new-born dignity; but the opportunities were so few by which a ceorl could raise himself above his rank, that the law could never overcome the reigning prejudice: the noble born still entertained the highest contempt for these legal and factitious thanes. According to the Domesday register, taken soon after the Norman conquest, there were 180,000 ceorls or freemen in England. In that book the denomination ceorl is rendered by the Latin term *villanus* or *villein* or villager. These, therefore, could all have been freeholders. Some were, indeed, *heorth fast men* or substantial householders; and others who possessed no domiciles of their own were termed *folghers* or followers, and were obliged by law to enter the family of a master as farm-servants or labourers. Another class of freemen comprised the burghers, traders, and artisans; and according to a law passed in the reign of Athelstan, if a burgher made three voyages over sea with a cargo of his own he was raised, like the prosperous ceorl, to the unenviable dignity of a thane. The lowest order of the population were the *theowes* — the servi of Domesday — who were absolute serfs or slaves, and who bore the drudgery of domestic life, or tended the cattle and swine of their masters. Some of these *theowes* were slaves from their birth, but others, called *witetheowes*, were persons who lost their freedom from inability to discharge their debts, or from the commission of some crime to which the penalty of serfdom was attached. The majority of them appear to have been born slaves; or relics of a conquered race, they being the most numerous where the British population maintained itself the longest. According to the Domesday, while the number was as one to three freemen in Gloucestershire, it was as one to five in Cornwall, Devon, and Staffordshire; one to ten in Kent; one to twenty in East Anglia; and one to two hundred and fifteen in Nottinghamshire. In the counties of York, Lincoln, Rutland, and Huntingdon, there were no slaves at the time of the Norman invasion. The condition of these slaves appears to have been at one time most abject, but the horrors of their servitude were gradually mitigated. In this particular, the Saxon clergy acted most meritoriously, for they not only enjoined their masters to give them rest from their labours, and to treat them as fellow-Christians, but they recommended their manumission as a charitable action, and procured a law, by way of example, that the slaves of a bishop should at his death be set free, and that all bishops and abbots in the kingdom should set three slaves at liberty. Their precepts, and, above all, their example, appear to have had a good effect, for many examples of voluntary emancipation are on record; and in some instances by the acquirement of property, the bondman purchased his own freedom. When slaves became free they were called *frilazin*; but though they were in reality free they were not considered as of the lower rank or dignity as those who had been freeborn.

Divisions of the Country and Courts of Justice.—Very little is known of the territorial divisions of the Anglo-Saxons. It would appear, however, that the country was from the time of their conquest divided into counties, hundreds, and tithings; over each of which a magistrate presided. Thus over the tithing there was a *decanus* or tithing-man; over the hundred a *centenary*, or hundreden; and over the county a count, earl, or alderman. Tithings were so called from ten free families in a *tun* or township being bound by enrolment to be responsible for the good behaviour of each other; a system of police called *frankpledge*, which Ingulphus relates had the happiest effect in the reign of Alfred the Great, when it was fully established and strictly executed; for, says he, "if a traveller left or lost ever so much money in the open fields or highways, he was sure of finding it next morning, or even a month after, entire and untouched." The township in which this system of frankpledge was carried out had its *hallmote*, at which inferior actions were tried by the seignor or his reeve, and a certain number of freemen; the germ of a modern jury. If any dispute could not be settled in the hallmote—that is, if any dispute of great difficulty or importance happened, or if either of the parties were not willing to submit to the sentence awarded by the seignor, or his reeve and the freemen—then the cause was referred, or appealed, to the next superior court, that of the hundred. The divisions called hundreds are supposed to have consisted of a hundred free families, or a hundred tithings, which would consist of a thousand families. North of the Trent, the hundred was called *Wapentake*, from a custom observed by the followers of the caldorman, who touched his weapon or spear, planted in the soil as a sign of recognition at his installation. The hundred

EALDORMAN.

had its *hundredmote*, in which the townships were represented by the seignor, or his reeve, and four deputies, and which was held monthly before its own hundredman or alderman. This court, which took cognizance of higher branches of jurisprudence than that of the hallmote, was held monthly before a magistrate called the *hundredary*, under writ from the sheriff. The post of hundredary was both honourable and

lucrative. It was generally occupied by a thane or nobleman residing within the hundred, who was elected by other members into his office. His office was to appoint the times and places of the meeting of the court; to preside therein, and to put its sentences into execution; and to inspect the arms belonging to the hundred; for he was not only their civil magistrate in times of peace, but their captain in war. In the county courts, or *shiremotes*, all the freeholders were assembled twice a year, and received appeals from the inferior courts. They were held twice a year, and were under the presidency of the bishops in whose districts they lay, the caldormen whose jurisdiction extended over them, and the sheriffs or shire-reeves. In these courts, each township was represented by its reeve and four freemen, and each hundred by a delegation of twelve of its members. From these territorial tribunals appeals lay to the king's court; but above all was the Witan, which was convened at the great festivals of Easter, Whitsuntide and Christmas, and whose duty it was to enact the laws, ratify the charters granted by the Crown, and to superintend the general affairs of the nation.

Laws.—On their first arrival in Britain, the Anglo-Saxons had no written laws. At that time they were simply governed, as their ancestors had been, by certain well-known and long-established customs. This was the case with all the northern nations who founded kingdoms on the ruins of the Roman Empire. But after these nations had established themselves in Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Britain, and had become acquainted with the art of writing, ancient customs became their written laws. Hence it is that there exists a striking similarity in the ancient laws of the Franks, Burgundians, Lombards, Visigoths, and Anglo-Saxons. All their laws were transcripts of the customs by which they had been governed in the wilds of Germany and Scandinavia.

As these nations, however, settled at a great distance from each other, in the lapse of time their laws became somewhat dissimilar. But even then for several centuries the dissimilarity consisted chiefly of the various amounts of fines that were inflicted on those guilty of crimes, according to the greater plenty of money in their respective countries. For in the earliest period of the Saxon legislature, its leading principle was that of pecuniary compensation rather than that of bodily infliction for the punishment of crime; the fines varying in amount according to the nature of the wrong committed, and the station of the party aggrieved. But during the long period of Anglo-Saxon legislation, other and greater punishments were awarded to criminals. For some offences, and especially if there had been a previous conviction, corporal punishments, banishment and slavery were inflicted; and homicide, burglary, arson, highway robbery, and treason, could only be expiated by the death of the offender. Some crimes were punished by outlawry, whipping, branding, standing in the pillory, plucking out of the eyes, mutilation of the nose, ears, and lips, and rooting out the hair of the head. But whatever punishment was inflicted for particular crimes committed, it was defined by the written law. The court had no discretion. The Anglo-Saxon laws were as irrevocable as those of the Medes and Persians. The law was written, and by that law the culprit was condemned. For instance, it defined not only a certain value upon every individual, whether plaintiff or defendant, what damage the one was entitled to receive and the other to pay, but every distinct limb or part of the body had its worth. Thus in the old laws a leg was valued at forty shillings, an eye-tooth at four, and a back tooth and finger-nail at one. Every personal injury had in this way its compensation; and after the trial had been gone through, the sentence or assessment of damages was a matter-of-course proceeding. There was no mitigation; the fine, whatever it might be, was written down in the laws, and it must be paid to the full. But in some cases summary punishment was allowed to be inflicted. The outlaw was said to "bear a wolf's head," and like a wolf he might, if he approached the haunts and habitations of men, be struck down by any hand, no one daring to revenge his fall. If a thief, also, was taken in actual possession of stolen goods, he might, by this kind of Lynch law, be hanged or decapitated by his captors without respite or delay. And so in the case of the murderer. If he was found standing near his victim with the weapon with which he had committed the crime in his hand, no witnesses could explain away the possession of a token which was considered to have been the necessary accompaniment of the transgression. The presumption of his guilt amounted to absolute certainty; he might not have committed the crime, but the Saxon law laid it down as a rule that he was guilty, and he must die.

The laws extant of this period are those of Ethelbert, Lothaire, Edric and Wihtred, successive kings of Kent; and Ina of Wessex. These were enacted before the overthrow of the Heptarchy. After that period there are the laws of Alfred, Edward the First, Athelstan, Edmund the First, Edgar, Ethelred the Second, Canute, and Edward the Confessor: the latter being a mere collection of the laws which had been enacted during the rule of the previous monarchs from the time of the Heptarchy.

The laws of Alfred and his successors may be classed under six distinct heads: declaratory, penal, procedure, religious, canonical, and moral. The declaratory laws appear to have consisted of expositions of rights and duties; the penal were those which had a definite sanction or penalty attached to them; those of procedure referred exclusively to the machinery for executing the rest; the religious regarded the people at large in relation with the Church or clergy; the canonical defined the duties and functions of the clerical body, apart from the people; and the moral may be said to have consisted only of moral precepts, such as enforeing obedience to parents, mercy to animals, and the due observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest.

If the manner of punishing crimes among the Anglo-Saxons was singular, not less so were the proofs. A trial in either of the courts partook of the nature of an arithmetical calculation, or a chemical experiment, rather than what would now be considered the trial of a cause. To explain. In criminal proceedings before the hundredmote, and probably other tribunals, twelve thanes constituted a grand

jury for the presentment of offenders, analogous to the modern custom of law courts. On a case being presented, the accuser made his charge, and the culprit was put upon his deliverance. At this stage of the trial, the accused was required to obtain the testimony of his superior; and if his superior appeared, and swore that the man had not been convicted of the crime, be it what it might, within the period of limitation, which appears to have been fixed by the last great council or witan, and had never paid the debt fine; and if this declaration was confirmed by the oaths of two other thanes or true men, then the culprit had the privilege of clearing himself either by simple compurgation, or by simple ordeal. If he asserted the liberty of appealing to that testimony of character termed compurgation, he himself swore to his innocence; and a certain number of his neighbours, whose worth, according to the legal arithmetic of the Saxons was considered as equivalent to one pound, were assigned as his compurgators. If these neighbours confirmed his oath by their own, he was acquitted of the charge; but if he could not produce this testimony of his innocence, and dared to abide by "the judgment of God," he underwent the ordeal: that is, he either plunged his arm into a boiling caldron up to his wrist, or bore a red-hot iron in his naked hand for the distance of nine paces; and if, after three days, no marks of injury appeared, he was acquitted of the charge laid against him. If he refused to afford the testimony required by law, the accused had to undergo a severer ordeal: he had to plunge his arm into boiling water up to the elbow, or carry a red-hot iron of treble weight. He had also to produce five compurgators, himself being the sixth. Civil suits were decided by a similar mode of procedure, though differing in some of the forms. In every case, however, everything depended upon the number and legal worth of the witnesses which each party—the accuser and the accused—was enabled to bring forward, or upon the issue of the ordeal. In some cases, the question was decided by an ordeal of the cross; that is, by the accused being allowed to draw from under a cover either of two pieces of wood, on one of which the figure of the cross was cut; if he drew that he was considered innocent, if not, he was found guilty. Another ordeal was that of the corsned; that is, a consecrated cake was given to the accused to eat, and if it appeared to stick in his throat, or if he shook or turned pale in his attempt to swallow it, the "judgment of God" was against him; he was condemned. Some writers have supposed that wager of battle was in use among the Anglo-Saxons. This ordeal was certainly common at this period among nations on the continent as a remedy against false evidence, but if it existed among the Anglo-Saxons it was not to any great extent. That species of jurisprudence rather belongs to the middle ages than to the present period of English history. One thing, however, is clear, that the ordeal was the grand mode of trial among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors.

But what was the ordeal of the Anglo-Saxons? What was the real character of the ceremony? And was it really a fiery one? Let us examine that of grasping hot iron. All ordeals were preceded by fastings, prayers, and other religious exercises. These preparations being made, the ordeal followed. In that of hot iron, the ordeal was of two kinds. It was either performed with a ball of iron of one, two, or three pounds weight according to the nature of the accusation, or with a certain number of ploughshares. Let us take the ball. It is made red-hot, and the accused takes it in his hand, first signing himself with the cross, and sprinkling his hand with holy water; and he carries it the distance of nine feet, and dropping it at the end of this short journey, his hand is put into a bag and sealed up for three days. At the expiration of that time the hand is examined in the presence of twelve persons on the side of each party, and if any marks of burning appear upon it he is declared guilty, if not he is innocent. Now it would be impossible for any one to take a really red-hot iron ball in his clenched hand, and to appear unscathed at the end of three short days. And yet many learned writers have been disposed to think that Providence graciously interposed when no marks of injury were found for the preservation of injured innocence. Some gross imposture, however, may be suspected in such an ordeal. The truth is this. The accused person was committed wholly to the priest, who was to perform the ceremony three days before the trial, during which time he had full opportunity of bargaining for his deliverance, and to receive instructions how to act his part. It may, indeed, be reasonably suspected that the monks of that age were in possession of some secret that secured the hand from the impressions of such a momentary touch of hot iron, or removed all appearances of those impressions within the given time that elapsed before the hand was examined. This suspicion, indeed, seems confirmed by the fact that there is no example of any champion of the Church suffering from this ordeal; while those who appealed to it in order to deprive the Church of its possessions never failed to suffer and to lose their cause. But absurd as the ordeal was, and liable to be open to impositions, it was, nevertheless, suitable to the social condition of the Anglo-Saxons. At that time there was not that wide-spread diffusion of intelligence which would supply intelligent judges and juries, and even if they could have been found their decisions would not have been understood. Nothing less than absolute certainty in such matters would have satisfied the simple understandings of the people of that period; and so long as the popular faith in the ordeal subsisted, it answered the twofold purpose of putting an end to differences, and of keeping the population under the dominion of the law. And as above shown, there is reason to believe that its inherent injustice was mitigated by the art and management—pious frauds—of those by whom the process was conducted. In the course of time, however, the popular belief in the trial of ordeal fell into decay; and this was followed by an effort to avoid it, as far as possible, by that of compurgation, and which, in its turn, was succeeded by that mode of trial now happily in use among us—by judge and jury.

CHAPTER III.

The History of Religion, from the Arrival of the Saxons, A.D. 449, to the Norman Conquest, A.D. 1066.

SECTION I.

IT has been seen, in a previous chapter, that towards the close of the Roman dominion the British Church was in a flourishing condition; and that when the Romans deserted Britain it became a prey to the ravages of the Picts and Scots, and could neither enjoy peace nor prosperity. The ruin of the British Church, which the Picts and Scots had commenced, was consummated by the Saxon invaders. By their conquest of our island, the ecclesiastical as well as civil government was overthrown. Once more pagan darkness overshadowed the land; Christianity was chiefly confined to those mountainous districts to which the Britons had fled for refuge. The storm of the Saxon invasion burst with violence on tower and temple; churches were destroyed, and their priests murdered, so that finally the former Christianity of the country was chiefly to be traced by heaps of ashes and tokens of devastation.

At the period of the settlement of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain, their religious system was essentially mythological. Like the ancient Britons, they had lost the faith of their forefathers, for when their ancestors first came from the East, and peopled Germany, they were not unacquainted with the great doctrines of one Supreme Deity, "the author of every thing that existeth; the Eternal, the Ancient, the living and awful Being; the Being that never changeth, who liveth and governeth during the ages; directing everything which is high, and everything which is low." Of this glorious Being—the one true God—whom they worshipped under the name of Odin, they esteemed it impious to make any visible representation, or to imagine it possible that He could be confined in temples made with hands. These great truths, however, which they brought with them from the East, in the lapse of time became corrupted. The worship of one Supreme Being had continued among them for several generations, but at length the leader of a new army of adventurers from the East overran the north of Europe and erected a mighty empire. This conqueror assumed the name of Odin, and claimed the honours which had formerly been paid to that deity. And such a divinity as this deified conqueror was better suited to the genius of a people who rushed like eagles to the slaughter than the Supreme Being whom their ancestors had worshipped. The deified conqueror, Odin, was a god of war; "the terrible and severe god; the father of slaughter; the god that carried desolation and fire; the active and roaring deity; the god that gave victory and revived courage in the conflict, and who named those that were to be slain." It was from Odin, or Wodin, that almost all the royal families of the northern nations deduced their origin. Hengist and Horsa were his reputed grandsons, although Wodin must have lived ages anterior to the Saxon invasion of Britain. But Wodin was not the only god worshipped by the Saxons. When the conqueror Odin claimed deification, he did not assume to himself the power of governing all things in heaven and earth. His business was to preside only over war, and hence associates were required to carry on the various operations above and below. And these were found in his own family. As he was believed to be the father, so his wife Friga, or Frea, was esteemed as the mother of all the gods. Next to Odin, she was the most revered of all the Scandinavian divinities, being worshipped as the goddess of love and pleasure, who bestowed on her votaries the delights of sensuality. Next in the Scandinavian mythology came the sons and the daughters of Odin and Frea. Thor, the eldest and the bravest, was also, as a natural consequence, the greatest. Thor was the controller of tempests; launching the thunder, pointing the lightning, and directing meteors, winds and storms from his palace in the aërial regions. It was to Thor that prayers were addressed for favourable rains, refreshing rains, and fruitful seasons. Of the other sons of Odin and Frea, Balder was the god of light, Niord of the waters, Tyr of champions, Brage of orators and poets, and Heimdal, the janitor or doorkeeper of heaven, and the guardian of the rainbow. In all, eleven sons and eleven daughters assisted their parents in the great work of ruling all things celestial and terrestrial, some of the latter being worshipped as goddesses of medicine, of virginity, of dress, of reconciliation, of vows, and of good manners. But besides these, there were many inferior divinities, including fiends, monsters, and fates. "The weird sisters of Macbeth" had their origin in Wyrd, who wove the web of destiny. Heroes were also worshipped; dead men, in whom imagination recognized some peculiar attribute which demanded reverence from mortals. There were also the Valkeries, a species of inferior goddesses who acted as celestial attendants, and who in times of war were employed by Odin to determine victory and select the warriors who were to perish. Added to these were genii and spirits, who mingled in every event of life, and were supposed to possess supernatural power to do good or evil. A malevolent spirit named Loke was the personification of evil. Loke was sometimes deprecated as a god, but always dreaded as an enemy. Such was his malignity, that he is represented as calumniating the gods themselves, for which wickedness the deities were compelled to shut him up in a cavern.

The Saxon priesthood taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and a state of rewards and punishments after death, utterly rejecting the notion of transmigration as an absurd fiction. Their heaven, or place of reward, was congenial to their warlike character. Those who perished bravely in battle ascended to Valhalla, where they spent the day in martial sports, and the night in feasting on the flesh of the boar Scrimmer, and drinking huge draughts of beer or mead from the skulls of their enemies, which were presented to them by virgins, ever young and ever beautiful. On the contrary, cowards and men of sloth were doomed to the miseries of Niflheim, where Hela dwelt, and exercised her terrible supremacy; her palace being Anguish, her table Famine, her waiters Expectation and Delay; while the threshold of her door was Precipice, her bed Leanness, and her very look Terror. But the bliss of the brave, and the misery of cowards, according to this grim mythology, were not eternal. There was to be a final dissolution of heaven and earth, when the malignant powers were to burst from their long enthralment and destroy the very gods themselves, not even sparing Odin; at the same time, a vast conflagration would consume Valhalla and the world and Niflheim, with all their divine, human, and infernal inhabitants. But out of this chaos was to arise a new and more glorious world than Valhalla, and a hell more terrible than Niflheim. Heroes and all good and just men were to be admitted into Gimle; while cowards, assassins, false swearers, and adulterers were to be confined in Nastrande, a place built of the carcasses of serpents. Over all a god was to preside, pre-eminent and alone, possessed of greater might and nobler attributes than Wodin; and the final state of the blessed and the doomed was to be eternal under his reign.

Such was the popular faith of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors. And their rites accorded with the spirit of their grim mythology. As before related, their forefathers deemed it impious to make any visible representations of the Odin they worshipped, and to erect temples wherein to worship. Before the period of the Saxon invasion, however, this faith had been corrupted. All over the Continent, temples were erected in which the deified conqueror Odin was represented by a gigantic image crowned and brandishing a naked sword; his wife Frea as an hermaphrodite; Thor wearing a crown of stars and wielding a mighty hammer; and all the other gods and goddesses represented according to the attributes with which they were supposed to be endowed. To these gods songs of praise were chanted, prayers were addressed, and sacrifices offered. Their songs of praise were almost innumerable, and they were composed under that wild inspiration which characterised the muse of the North. Their prayers were dictated by their priests, and they were of the earth, earthy. To Odin they prayed for victory in battle; to Frea for success in love and courtship; to Thor to avert his thunderbolts from themselves, and to hurl them against their enemies; to Niord for prosperous voyages and successful fishing; and to Freya for favourable seasons, and good and plentiful crops. All the gods and goddesses were petitioned for the favours which they were supposed to have in their gift; and all their prosperity and success in mundane affairs were ascribed to their influence. Sometimes, however, their gods were supposed to be deaf to their prayers, for if they imagined that they did not receive the blessings asked for, their displeasure was testified by shooting their arrows, and throwing their darts toward heaven with all the rage of offended mortals. As in other rituals, in order to give efficacy to their petitions, animals were offered up in sacrifice by the priests, and their blood was sprinkled upon their worshippers. These animals were offered in the kind deemed most acceptable to the several deities. Thus horses, dogs, falcons, cocks, and fat bulls were offered to Odin; hogs, for their sensuality, to Frea; and fat oxen and horses to Thor. In times of famine, or other national calamities, or at the eve of some dangerous war, sterner sacrifices were deemed necessary. On such occasions, the blood of human victims drenched their altars; those victims being commonly chosen from among criminals, captives, or slaves, but occasionally, as in times of pestilence, persons of the highest dignity. At these sacrifices, sensual enjoyments were not forgotten. Their favourite liquor, ale, was liberally handed round, of which they imbibed freely, ejaculating some wish or prayer at every draught they quaffed.

Very little is known concerning the degrees and orders in the hierarchy among the German nations. Cæsar says that they had no Druids to preside over their rites; and Tacitus, though he frequently mentions priests, never calls them by that name. It is certain that there were priests, but they appear to have had very little influence in matters of government. They were not, like the Druids of Britain, legislators and judges, from which it may be inferred that they were not held in the highest esteem. There is evidence on record, indeed, that the Saxon priesthood were not satisfied with their position. Thus the chief priest of the Northumbrians, debarred from all power and honour, remarked to King Edwin that there was not one of his subjects who had served the gods with so much devotion as he had done, and yet there were many who received more ample honours and greater rewards than had fallen to his lot. He appears to have become an infidel, for he naïvely asked Edwin, "If these gods had any power would they not assert it in his favour, who had worshipped them with so much zeal?" The Saxon priestesses had no such complaints to make, for they were regarded with peculiar veneration. They enjoyed greater authority and higher honours than the priests, some of them being consulted as infallible oracles, and even dreaded as the ministers of the vengeance of heaven. Those who served the malignant deities, indeed, were regarded as witches of mightier power than those who in ancient times presided over the far-famed oracles of Greece.

Such were the leading features of the religion which our Saxon ancestors brought with them from the north into our island. Such also it continued, with perhaps some modifications, until their conversion to Christianity. And even then, it may be concluded that some remnants of their grim theology remained deep rooted in the Saxon mind. This was

more especially the case as regards their superstitions, some of which remain to the present day. The remembrance of their religion is even preserved in some of the names of the days of our weeks; Wednesday being derived from their god Odin or Wodin; Thursday from Thor; and Friday from Frea; a consecration which William of Malmesbury not inaptly terms sacrilege.

It must not be supposed, however, that during the period of Saxon paganism the light of Christianity was utterly extinguished. The great bulk of the British Christian population had retired into Wales, where they enjoyed their faith in peace, but some portion still remained as the bondmen of their conquerors. And these still retained their faith, although, from the absence of both churches and clergy, it may naturally be supposed that it became corrupted. There is direct and unquestionable testimony that the light of the Gospel was preserved in some degree by that part of the British which remained in the southern parts of the island. It is even possible that some, animated by a missionary spirit, remained with a view of attempting the conversion of the Saxons. It would appear, indeed, that Offa, a Saxon of the royal blood, was converted by some pious Britons; and though, therefore, they could not preserve the outward appearance of a church, they kept the faith "once delivered to the saints." These acted as leaven among the conquerors; and hence, when Augustin arrived in England for the purpose of converting its inhabitants, he found some professors of the Gospel even in the court of Kent. The British church, therefore, at this period, though "cast down was not destroyed;" it bowed before the grim idolatry of the North, but it was not wholly swept away. When the Saxons came into the country, they were inflamed with the most violent animosity against Christianity; but when the fierceness of their contests abated, when they began to make treaties of peace with its ancient inhabitants, their animosity diminished; and hence, when Augustin came from Rome to proclaim the glad tidings of the Gospel, he was received, if not gladly, yet with respect for his mission.

SECTION II.

ACCORDING to the common story, the mission of Augustin to England had its origin in this incident. One day before Gregory the Great was advanced to the Papal chair, he saw a number of comely Saxon youths in the slave market at Rome. Struck with their appearance, he inquired who they were, and being told that they were Angles, he exclaimed, "Angels they are, and they ought to be joined to the angelic company." On being further told that they came from the province of Deira, he replied, "Ay, *De Ira*, indeed, from the wrath of God they must be plucked." His passion for quibbling still continued. When he learned that the name of their king was Ella, he rejoined, "Alleluia! alleluias must be chanted by them in the dominions of their sovereign." This story is gravely related by Bede as an historical fact; but it may be suspected that it was fabricated in the cloister. It is clear, however, that British slaves, and perhaps some Saxons, were an article of traffic at Rome; and it is equally clear that Gregory, however touched he may have been by the ambitious spirit of his church, was a man of truly Christian benevolence. He had, no doubt, seen some of these fair-skinned slaves in the Roman market-place, and knowing that Britain had relapsed into heathenism, he might readily perceive that there was a noble field for his pious exertions in its conversion. On assuming the tiara himself, he could not undertake this mission in person, but he was resolved to carry it out, which he did in a spirit in which zeal was happily blended with prudence. In the year 597, according to the Saxon chronicle, "Augustin and his companions—forty monks—came to England." These were Gregory's missionaries.

Augustin and his companions landed in the Isle of Thanet, accompanied by "interpreters of the nation of the Franks." This was a wise step. Ethelbert, to whose dominions in Kent the missionaries came, had married Behrta, daughter of Charibert, King of the Franks; and by the terms of the marriage contract the queen enjoyed the exercise of Christian worship. To us it appears, indeed, that it was rather from her invitation that Gregory sent his missionaries to England, than from seeing British or Saxon slaves in Rome. A Christian herself, Behrta would naturally seek the conversion of her pagan husband, and his pagan subjects. Be that as it may, Augustin and his monks and his interpreters found no difficulty in gaining access to King Ethelbert. According to Bede's narrative, Ethelbert, hearing of the arrival of the missionaries and the nature of their mission, ordered them to stay in the island, where they should be furnished with all necessaries. He continues: "Some days after the king came into the island"—from his palace at Richborough—"and sitting in the open air, ordered Augustin and his companions to be brought into his presence; for he had taken precaution that they should not come to him in any house, according to an ancient superstition, lest if they had any magical arts they might, at their coming, impose upon and get the better of him. But they came furnished with divine virtue, not with diabolical, bearing a silver cross for their banner, and the image of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board, and singing the litany, offered up their prayers to their Lord for their own, and the eternal salvation of those to whom they were come. Having, pursuant to the king's command, after sitting down, preached to him and all his attendants there present the Word of Life, he answered thus:—'Your words and promises are very taking, but in regard that they are new and uncertain, I cannot approve of them, forsaking that which I have so long followed with the whole English nation. But because you are come from far into my kingdom, and as I conceive are desirous to impart to us those things which you believe to be true and more beneficial, we will not molest you, but rather give you favourable entertainment, and take care to supply you with necessary sustenance; nor do we forbid you by preaching to gain as many as you can to your religion.' Accordingly he gave them a dwelling-place in the city of Canterbury, which was the metropolis of all his dominions; and pursuant to his

promise, besides allowing them their diet, permitted them to preach."

It is related that Augustin and his fellow-missionaries entered the city of Canterbury in solemn procession, chanting these words: "We beseech thee, O Lord! of thy mercy let thy wrath and anger be turned away from this city, and from this holy place; for we have sinned. Hallelujah!" According to the monkish chronicles, their success was marvellous. Not only was Ethelbert himself converted, but thousands of his subjects; not less than ten thousand being baptized on Christmas-day. This number is probably overstated; but it is certain, that under the protection of Ethelbert the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon church was securely laid; that Christianity, as taught by Augustin and his fellow-labourers, rapidly spread among his subjects.

Great was the joy of Pope Gregory when he heard of the success of Augustin among the pagan Saxons in Britain. His success tended to his own aggrandizement. The archbishop of Arles consecrated him archbishop of Canterbury, and Gregory conferred the primacy of the whole island upon that city. There can be no doubt that both Gregory and Augustin were animated with zeal for the cause of Christianity in the conversion of the Saxons, but their zeal was not of the purest kind. In the first place, there was considerable temporising in their labours. Lest a total change in the modes of worship should have an adverse effect, Gregory advised that the heathen temples should not be destroyed: Augustin was only to have the images of the gods removed therefrom, to wash the walls with holy water, to erect altars, and to deposit relics in them, that the people might be the more easily prevailed upon to frequent the places of worship to which they had been accustomed. The very ceremonies of the Christian worship were to be assimilated as much as possible to those of the heathen, lest the people, startled by the change, should relapse into idolatry. All Christian converts were to be allowed to kill and eat a great number of oxen as heretofore on certain festivals; only they were to be eaten to the glory of God, and not, as before, to the honour of the devil. All these admonitions were strictly observed, and the natural consequence was, that the grossest superstitions became strangely mingled with the ancient simplicity of the Christian worship. The zeal of Gregory and Augustin was also marred by ambition. Augustin was authorized to ordain twelve bishops in his own province of Canterbury; to consecrate an archbishop of York; and as soon as the people in the north were converted, to ordain twelve suffragans or bishops to that see. The pall—an ornament peculiar to metropolitans—was sent direct to Augustin; another was to be sent to the archbishop of York when he was consecrated. Augustin was to have the primacy over all the bishops in both provinces. Had Gregory stopped here it might have been all very well, for it would have been nothing but right that he should have some power over bishops of his own creation. But ambition did not stop here: Augustin was to be primate over all the British bishops. Now, although this was not a distinct claim to universal pastorship, it was a step in that direction; it was assuming authority over prelates who had never been subject to the see of Rome. "We commit all the British bishops to you:" would they submit to such an assumption of power? Certainly not. No sooner had Augustin received this authority from the Roman pontiff than he sought an interview with the prelates of the British church, and two meetings are recorded, which may be regarded as two distinct councils, or as two sessions of the same council. The place of meeting was in Worcestershire; the archbishop and his suffragans, like the Druids of old, taking counsel under the branches of an oak.

At the first meeting, which was attended not only by the British bishops, but by many learned men from their monasteries, Augustin demanded allegiance to the see of Rome. He insisted especially that they should conform to the Roman custom in the celebration of Easter—they having, as he stated, hitherto followed St. John and the Eastern churches; that they should administer baptism according to the order of Roman ministration; and that they should unite with the Roman missionaries to preach the gospel to the Saxons. To these demands the British bishops dissented, and requested another conference. In that second conference Augustin repeated his demands; informing them, that though they practised many ceremonies different from those of the Romish church, he would be content with their obedience to the three specified. The British bishops, however, replied that they could neither depart from their own ceremonies nor own him as their superior. Dinoth, abbot of Bangor, boldly avowed that they would neither own the Roman pride nor bow to the Saxon tyranny. "Be it known," said he, "and without doubt unto you, that we all are, and every one of us, obedient and subject to the church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree in perfect charity, and to help every one of them in word and deed, to be the children of God; and other obedience than this I do not know due to him whom you name Pope, nor to be the father of fathers to be claimed and to be demanded; and this obedience we are ready to give and pay to him and every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Caer Leon upon Usk, who is to oversee under God, over us, to cause us to keep the way spiritual." Bede relates, that the rejection of his proposals put the "meek apostle" Augustin into such a passion that he threatened them with the wrath of heaven; and predicted that since they would not join with him in the conversion of the Saxons, by the sword of the Saxons they should perish. As the flames of war soon broke out between the Saxons and the Britons, involving the latter in the greatest calamities, the monkish chroniclers ascribe it as the just judgment of heaven upon them for the obstinacy of their bishops: but there is reason to believe that Augustin was instrumental in bringing about the fulfilment of his own prediction.

Having thus failed in reducing the British churches under his authority, Augustin applied himself to the enlargement and regulation of the Saxon church he had founded. He consecrated Justus, bishop of Rochester; Mellitus, bishop of the East Saxons; and Laurentius to be his own successor in the see of

Canterbury. These consecrations took place A.D. 604, and either in that year or the next he died; the knowledge and profession of Christianity being still confined among the people of Kent.

Laurentius, on becoming archbishop of Canterbury, laboured diligently to induce both the British and Scottish clergy to adopt the Romish usages, especially as respecting the observance of Easter. His efforts, however, were fruitless. In the mean time, Mellitus was successfully labouring to convert the East Saxons, who inhabited the counties of Essex and Middlesex. A bishop's see was established in London, then the capital of that little state; its prince, nephew to King Ethelbert, to whom he was tributary, and his people generally, having previously embraced the Christian religion. But the conversion of the Saxons at this period very much depended upon their kings; if they became Christians they followed their example, but if their successors were pagans, or if any of them relapsed into idolatry, apostacy became the order of the day. Thus it was at the death of Ethelbert; for his son and successor Eadbald, who married his father's widow, having renounced Christianity, the newly-founded Christian church in Kent tottered to its fall. In the conversions of this period, indeed, there was no radical change of heart; and the temporising policy of the Romish church was adverse to the growth of pure Christian principles. In such a deplorable condition was the infant church, that two of its bishops — Mellitus and Justus — retired into France; and Laurentius was about to take his departure also, when Eadbald it is said, struck with remorse, put away his mother-in-law and returned to the profession of Christianity. Laurentius resumed the duties of his office and invited his brethren to return. Justus was restored to the see of Rochester; but there had been a similar apostacy among the East Saxons, and Mellitus failed to recover his bishopric of London. Laurentius, however, dying A.D. 619, Mellitus succeeded him in his archbishopric, and when he died, A.D. 624, Justus became archbishop of Canterbury.

It was about this time that Christianity was introduced into Northumbria. Edelburga, daughter of Ethelbert, having married Edwin, had by the marriage stipulations the free exercise of the Christian religion secured to her and her household. Paulinus was consecrated bishop by Justus, and he accompanied Edelburga into Northumberland. Paulinus was allowed to preach the gospel to as many as were willing to hear it, and though he was for some time unsuccessful, yet when Edwin himself became a Christian, his court and his people, according to custom, followed his example. Even Coiffi the high priest of Northumbria embraced the Christian religion. It is said that he mounted a horse—the striding of which was forbidden to his order—and bursting into the consecrated precinct of his temple, hewed that idol in pieces to whose services his life had been devoted. Coiffi was the priest who complained that his devotion to his pagan gods had been profitless in honour and wealth, and he now had his revenge. The success of Paulinus after this was, according to Nennius, remarkable; the crowds of converts being so great, that on one occasion he baptized twelve thousand in the river Swale. But as usual it was the influence of Edwin, and not the eloquence of Paulinus, that obtained converts. By that influence, coupled with the ministry of Paulinus, the King of the East Angles, and many of his subjects, became Christians, especially those who inhabited Lincolnshire. Edwin erected a bishop's see for Paulinus, and obtained a pall for him from Pope Honorius. Yet after all there was little Christianity in Northumbria. Edwin died A.D. 633—and it was the old story: there was universal apostacy, and Paulinus was compelled to retire into Kent, where he became bishop of Rochester.

ROCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

But the Northumbrians and East Anglians—for both apostatized at the same time—did not long remain in a state of apostacy. Oswald, who had lived many years among the Scots, and had been instructed in the truths of Christianity in that country, having recovered the kingdom of Northumbria, sent into Scotland for Christian clergy to instruct his subjects. Aidan, one of the most pious and learned of these Scottish missionaries, was appointed the first bishop of Lindisfarne or Holy Island, to which place the bishop's seat was removed from York. The Northumbrians again embraced Christianity, and about the same time it was re-introduced among the East Angles. Sigebert, having lived some time in exile among the Franks, and had been converted, brought with him on his restoration Felix, a Burgundian priest, who was appointed the first bishop of the East Anglians; his see, according to Bede, being fixed at a place called Domnoc. Among the kings of the Heptarchy, few had greater influence in the introduction of Christianity in our island than Oswald of Northumbria. Having in the year 635 married the daughter of the King of Wessex, he greatly contributed to the success of Berinus, a missionary from Rome, who was at that time preaching the gospel to the West Saxons. Cynigisel, through his persuasion, not only embraced the Christian religion, but founded a see at Dorchester: Berinus being the first bishop of the West Saxons. At a later date Oswy

king of Northumbria was instrumental in restoring the East Saxons from their long apostacy; Sigebert being persuaded by him to embrace Christianity. The conversion of Sigebert was followed by the conversion of most of his subjects through the preaching of Chad, a Northumbrian priest, who was consecrated to the see of London by the bishop of Lindisfarne. Nor did Oswy's influence in the spread of Christianity stop here. The kingdom of Mercia, which consisted of all the middle parts of England, had hitherto continued in pagan darkness. Its king, Penda, had been the most inveterate persecutor of those kings of the Heptarchy who had embraced the Christian religion. His son Piada married a daughter of Oswy, and on his return from the court of that prince—having, it is said, been converted while at Oswy's court—he was accompanied by four Northumbrian priests, who preached the gospel in Mercia with great success. Diuma, a Scotchman, was consecrated the first bishop of Mercia, by the bishop of Lindisfarne.

By this time, the knell of Saxon Paganism may be said to have been tolled. The Christian faith was once more the professed religion in our island. It will, therefore, be no longer necessary to trace the foundations of bishoprics, for that would be wearisome and profitless to the reader, and we pass on to notice that great episode in our national history, the struggle for Romish supremacy: a struggle which fairly set in during the reign of Oswy, king of Northumbria.

SECTION III.

Some of the kingdoms of the Heptarchy having been converted by missionaries from Rome, and some by missionaries from Scotland, it followed as a natural consequence that the rites and usages of the churches established by different teachers were not in unison. This was not agreeable to the Romish policy. It became, therefore, the undeviating rule of the Romish adherents in England to reduce the British, and those Saxons who conformed to the usages of the British churches, to those of Rome. As we have seen, both Augustin and Laurentius had made the attempt on the former, and had failed; but opposition only made Rome more desirous of conquering; just as when the Romans of old, when fighting for the conquest of the world, were by defeat stirred up to renewed exertions to satisfy their lust of dominion; the only difference being, that whereas Pagan Rome fought with carnal, Papal Rome fought with spiritual weapons.

The subjects of controversy in the reign of Oswy were the same as those which had formed the debate between Augustin and the British bishops; namely, the Easter festival, with other observances, that of the *tonsure* being added: whether it should be that of Peter or Paul, or none whatever. The grand point was the Easter festival: when was that to be observed? Those churches planted by the missionaries of Rome kept Easter on the first Sunday after the fourteenth, and before the twenty-second day of the first moon after the vernal equinox; while those planted by the Scotch kept that festival as the British churches generally did, on the first Sunday after the thirteenth, and before the twenty-first day of the same moon. By this means, when the fourteenth day of the moon happened on a Sunday, those of the British or Scotch communion celebrated the feast of Easter on that day; while those of the Romish communion did not celebrate theirs till the Sunday following. It really did not seem a matter of great moment, but yet it was so to the Romish church; for if that point was gained, it was at least one step towards supremacy. To settle this grave question, therefore, a council was summoned at Whitby in Yorkshire, A.D. 664, by Oswy; he being personally interested in the matter; for while he kept the festival according to the British or Scotch ritual, his queen and son observed it according to the Roman. All the learned divines on both sides assembled at Whitby to determine the controversy. On the one side it was argued by the Scotch orators that their manner of celebrating Easter was prescribed by St. John the beloved disciple. This was no mean argument; but the Romanists had one far stronger, in the opinion of Oswy, who, in reality, was the arbitrator on this notable occasion. The Romans affirmed that theirs was instituted by Peter, the prince of the apostles, who kept the keys of heaven. Bede says, that both parties acknowledged that Peter did keep the keys; but that may be doubted. Oswy, however, was so far convinced by this argument, that he decided in favour of the Romish ritual: he would observe all his institutions, he said, to the utmost of his power, lest, when he came to the gate of heaven Peter should turn his back upon him. From that time Oswy not only embraced the Romish customs, but became zealous in his endeavours to bring all the English churches to a conformity with, and obedience to the church of Rome. It was Oswy, in connection with Egbert, king of Kent, who sent the first archbishop elect of Canterbury—Wighart—to Rome to be consecrated according to the Roman ritual. So completely did the Romanists triumph on this occasion, that many of the Scotch clergy, among whom was Bishop Colman, quitted Northumbria, and returned to their own country.

Oswy was clearly ignorant of the ulterior designs of the Pope and his adherents. With him it was but the simple question of the observance of a festival. That was the subject of the controversy. There was no pretensions made at this council, that either the Pope of Rome or the Archbishop of Canterbury had any jurisdiction or authority over the churches in the north of England. Had any such claim been made, it is probable that Oswy would not have so readily complied with the Roman customs. The Saxon monarchs were not men who would willingly part with their power, or acknowledge a superior. Hence, when, a few years afterward, A.D. 668, they generally acquiesced in the appointment of Theodore, a native of Cilicia, to the archbishopric of Canterbury, by Pope Vitalian, with the express understanding that he was to establish the Roman discipline in England, they did not recognize the papal authority. They were still free and independent sovereigns, each ruling in his own kingdom, according to his own laws, and the Anglo-Saxon church was in a great measure still independent; but how long was

that freedom and independence to remain? There was a spirit abroad at Rome which could not rest satisfied till not only all ecclesiastical, but all secular power was swallowed up in its ambitious pretensions.

The usurpation of Pagan Rome over the thrones of Christendom is one of the most marvellous events recorded in the annals of history. Pagan Rome, it is true, extended its power over the then known world, but it was by the edge of the sword. Armies after armies were poured from its gates, first led by consuls, and then by emperors and their generals, till thrones and kingdoms, in all quarters of the globe, acknowledged its sway, or were destroyed by its legions. In vain did the Carthaginians, Etruscans, Samnites, Syracusans, and other great and mighty states struggle to maintain their liberty and independence; and in vain did those great warriors of old, Hannibal of Carthage, Pontius of Samnium, Pyrrhus of Epirus, and Mithridates of Cappadocia, exert their skill and their valour to lay their haughty opponent low: Rome triumphed over all, and for a long period became mistress of the world. But the conquests of Pagan Rome, extended, and, marvellous as they were, sink into insignificance when compared with the achievements of Papal Rome. These were not made with the sword, but by craft and superstition, weapons which were found to be all-powerful, for through them she eventually said in her heart, "I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow."

The first claim to universal pastorship appears to have been made by Boniface, the immediate successor of Gregory; and the claim which he made to supremacy became the policy of all the pontiffs who came after him. And in this pretension, Boniface and his successors found invariable support in England from the successive archbishops of Canterbury. The means taken to obtain an acknowledgment of that supremacy were slow but sure; the achievement was not the work of a day, but of ages. One step had been taken in that direction, as before seen, at the synod of Whitby; another was taken by Theodore, who having received the clerical tonsure after the Roman form, came to England as Archbishop of Canterbury. It was Theodore who first established an uniformity of church discipline and government, and who framed and consolidated the whole scheme of ecclesiastical polity in England. He consecrated bishops where they were required, and reduced everything to a perfect conformity to the Church of Rome. He is said to have been very serviceable to the church, by the learning which he and his friend Adrian introduced, and to have advanced the establishment of parish churches, by allowing founders to become their patrons. He also divided some of the larger bishoprics, which were at that time generally co-extensive with the kingdoms to which they belonged. Through his means, likewise, chapels and oratories were erected in every diocese, in order to remedy the precarious supply of preachers, who had hitherto been attached to the cathedrals under the direction and control of the bishop, and had imparted religious instruction to the population by open-air preaching.

Theodore was an enlightened prelate for his age, and his spirit for a time animated the clerical order. Their intellectual attainments were respectable, and their attention to their sacred duties praiseworthy, if not exemplary. Bede bears testimony to their zeal, disinterestedness, and temperance; on which that faithful chronicler Wordsworth, whose ecclesiastical sonnets may be considered pictures of the church at different periods, writes:—

> "How beautiful your presence, how benign,
> Servants of God! who not a thought will share
> With the vain world; who outwardly as bare
> As winter trees yield no fallacious sign
> That the firm soul is clothed with fruit divine!
> Such priest, when service worthy of his care
> Has called him forth to breathe the common air,
> Might seem a saintly image from its shrine
> Descended."

The zeal, learning, and piety of Theodore obtained for him the particular favour of the Saxon monarchs. It appears that it was under their auspices he convened a synod of bishops and presbyters at Hertford, A.D. 673. At this synod, the bishops of the East Angles, West Saxons, Mercians, and Rochester were present; while Wilfrid, archbishop of York, was represented by proxy. It was at this synod that the Anglican church was settled according to the Roman model. The vexed question of the Easter festival was finally decided—it was to be observed on the Sunday after the full moon—as well as other matters connected with the conduct of the clergy in general. Indeed, the discipline of the church was finally settled in this synod of Hertford; and that discipline was a counterpart of that of the Church of Rome. This was a long stride towards the goal of supremacy; but the design was not made manifest to Theodore himself, by whose influence and means it was taken. If the people worked in this age like "congregated bees," to "build fortresses" where piety might enjoy retirement, the pope of Rome worked mole-like under ground to throw up a monument of power, before which all Christendom should tremble.

The supremacy of the pope over the Anglican church was further advanced by a dispute which arose between Theodore and Wilfrid archbishop of York. Wilfrid was banished by the King of Northumberland, as some allege for refusing to submit to the canons enacted in the synod of Hertford, but according to others, for opposing the division of his see, which comprehended all the country between the Humber and the Frith of Forth. He is represented by Bede as vain and ostentatious, and as living in greater magnificence than Egfrid, king of Northumbria, and he alleges this as a reason why Egfrid sought to humble him by dividing his bishopric. But Wilfrid was not of a temper to submit to a diminution of his revenues and authority. He repaired to court, and boldly accused the king and Theodore of injustice, and appealed from them to the pope. An appeal to the pope had not yet been heard of in England, and Egfrid and his counsellors could not believe that Wilfrid was serious, but nevertheless he went to Rome to lay his case before the pontiff. A synod or consistory was called at Rome, which consisted of the incumbents of parishes in that city

to consider the matter. It was called, the pope explained, to take into consideration the state of the church in England: Theodore wished to appoint several bishops in the north, by dividing the see, which Wilfrid opposed. What was to be done? The council decided in favour of Theodore. There appears, however, to have been another council held at Rome, consisting of bishops, preparatory to a council summoned at this time to meet the emperor at Constantinople, which, after reconsidering the case, enacted a decree in favour of Wilfrid. But this decision of the council at Constantinople was rendered null and void by Theodore, who was doubtless seconded by the Saxon monarchs. Wilfrid hastened back to England to take repossession of his see; but Theodore set the sentence of the council which decreed his restoration at nought, and the King of Northumberland, in support of his views, cast Wilfrid into prison. This circumstance proves that not only the Saxon monarchs had the control both over ecclesiastical and civil matters in England, but that the supreme authority of the pope was not so much as dreamt of by those who were in communion with Rome. As yet it was but an embryo in its shell, but

"The way is smooth
For power that travels with the human heart."

This truth is illustrated in the final result of the case of Wilfrid. Through the intercession of Æbbe, abbess of Coldingham, when he had been in prison for a year, he was released. After this, he preached in the kingdom of Sussex, the only kingdom of the Heptarchy which had not received Christianity; and having been instrumental in converting its king and population, Theodore and his friend Alfred, who had succeeded his brother Egfrid in the Northumbrian kingdom, A.D. 685, so far relaxed their anger towards him as to restore him to the sees of Hexham and York. But Wilfrid soon forfeited his new honours. In the year 701 a council was assembled at Osterfield by Alfred, in which the bishop was summoned to appear for the purpose of answering certain charges. At this council, Wilfrid boldly charged its members with despising the apostolic see, and preferring the canons of Theodore. In reply, the synod declared that the see of Rome could not interfere with an Anglican council, and that his appeal to Rome had justified their decision. One of the charges, indeed, against Wilfrid was, that he had refused to submit to the sentence of the archbishop and synod, whose decrees, it was declared, could not be altered by the apostolic see. The council punished Wilfrid for his contumacy by depriving him of all his preferments except the abbey of Ripon, which was left him for a retreat; and when Wilfrid protested against this sentence, and appealed to the pope, Alfred was so incensed against him, that he would have commanded his guards to cut him in pieces, if the bishops had not interposed. Wilfrid again resorted to Rome, and the pope recommended his restoration to his see. Some years afterwards, indeed, when the feeling against him was softened, Brightwald, who had succeeded Theodore in the archbishopric of Canterbury, A.D. 692, went into Northumberland, and by his influence obtained the consent of the court of Northumberland, for the assembling of a council to decide on the case of Wilfrid. That council was held on the banks of the river Nidd, in Yorkshire, and Brightwald presided. At that time, A.D. 705, Alfred was dead; and his son Osred, a child of nine years of age, was King of Northumbria. At this council, Brightwald stated the wishes of the pope respecting Wilfrid: those wishes being, that he should be restored to his dignities and possessions in Northumberland. The pope, indeed, had pronounced a sentence in favour of Wilfrid; but neither his wishes nor his sentence would have been complied with, had it not been for Ælfleda, abbess of Whitby, and sister of Alfred, who was, no doubt, in the pope's interest. She communicated that Alfred on his dying bed had renounced his resentment against Wilfrid, and had made a vow that, should he recover, he would restore him to his see. This circumstance induced the council so far to comply with the pope's wishes and sentence, as to restore Wilfrid to the bishopric of Hexham and the abbey of Ripon. Thus, what the pope could not effect by virtue of open authority, was brought to pass through a woman's appeal to the feelings of the council. The whole was probably a gross imposition, but it served the pontiff's purpose: if he did not obtain a direct acknowledgment of his authority, he at least obtained a show of deference.

The deference paid to the bishops of Rome at this period, was impolitic; inasmuch as it encouraged them in their career of ambition. In no instance was this seen more clearly than in the council of Cloveshoo, in Kent, A.D. 747, which was called in consequence of letters from Pope Zachary, and in the council of Calcuith, in Mercia, held A.D. 787. It is true that in the former the Anglican church met the attempts made to obtain an acknowledgment of supremacy with stern opposition; but its obedience to the directions, or commands, or wishes of Zachary was ominous. To have exhibited its independence, no account should have been taken of this haughty pontiff's letters: the designs of Zachary must have appeared more manifestly encroaching and ambitious than any of his predecessor's. In France he had obtained a vast accession of secular power, by the sanction which he had given to the usurpation of Pepin; for in order to establish himself on his throne, that usurper invested his dynasty with the mysterious sanction of religion, instead of resting his claims to popular election. This gave to the pontiff a power long sought, but hitherto sought in vain—supremacy over thrones. Knowing this—for this thing was not done in a corner—the people of England should have taken the alarm, and have gathered tight around them the folds of the garments of independence, lest they should likewise have become slaves. But nations in this age appear to have been so dazzled with the splendour of the papal court, that they could not see through the flimsy veil which ill concealed its ambition. The withering influence of that ambition, indeed, was fast gathering over all Christendom.

"Black demons hovering o'er his wicked head,"

the pontiff of Rome was surely working his way to the summit of all earthly power, from whence, with

haughty breath, he might say to the monarchs, who would have disdained to have yielded the palm of victory to any secular power—

> "Ere I absolve thee, stoop! that on thy neck
> Levelled with earth this foot of mine may tread."

It was at the council of Calcuith that the bishop of Rome first gained any manifest ascendancy over the Anglican church. At that council, two legates were present, who brought with them certain canons which had been framed at Rome. These canons had been previously subscribed to in a Northumbrian synod, and at the council in Mercia they were signed by Offa, King of the Mercians, the Archbishop of Canterbury, twelve bishops, and many abbots and nobles. This was no mean triumph, and so these legates seem to have considered, for they boasted that they were the first priests who had come over from Rome since the days of Augustin. It must not be supposed, however, that the Saxon sovereigns and bishops recognized the pope's supremacy at the council of Calcuith. The canons to which they subscribed their names did not involve any subjection to the see of Rome; but it was by such advances as these that the Roman pontiff did finally succeed in establishing his authority over the Anglican church. "The canons of the council of Calcuith" were twenty in number, and the character of them was generally that of advancing new claims; such as a divine right to the tenth of all the possessions of the laity, and an exemption from being tried and punished by the civil magistrates. Even those canons which savour of puerility had in them the germs of a domineering spirit; such as the prohibition of priests celebrating mass without shoes or stockings, and with chalices made of horn, and the bishop sitting on the bench with aldermen, and judging in criminal causes. Subsequently, at the councils of Finchenall and Acleam, A.D. 788, 789; at Becauceld and Cloveshoo, A.D. 800; at Cloveshoo again, A.D. 803; and at Calcuith, A.D. 816, there are traces of the pope's growing influence, and the consequent debasement of the Anglican church. For it must be remembered, that while that church maintained her purity, she maintained her independence; and that when she became corrupted, then she became debased.

And the Anglican church was at this period becoming corrupt to its very heart's core. Ignorance and superstition had increased therein greatly, as well as throughout all Christendom. Pilgrimages to Rome had become more frequent, and were attended with worse effects than formerly; the rage of retiring into monasteries had become more violent in persons of all ranks, to the ruin of all military discipline, and of every useful art; and the clergy had become more knavish and rapacious, and the laity more abject than in any former period. There was a golden trade carried on in relics by the clergy, especially the monks, who were fortunate enough to make daily discoveries of the remains of some departed saint which were readily converted into gold. Of course many of these wares were counterfeit; for who could tell the great toe of a sinner from that of a saint when exhumed from the grave? Kings and subjects alike were eager to avail themselves of such precious relics. The grandest discovery made at this period was that of the body of St. Alban, the proto-martyr of Britain, his resting-place being said to have been pointed out to Offa, king of the Mercians, in a vision of the night. It was taken up with much ceremony in the presence of three bishops and people of all ranks, and enclosed in a rich shrine adorned with gold and precious stones, and at the place where his body was found a stately monastery was erected to his honour. Offa, who was one of the vilest of the Saxon monarchs, was also one of the most superstitious. Vast sums of money were squandered away by him to procure the pardon of his sins, for it was one of the leading tenets of the Romish clergy that gold could procure absolution from all sins, however great and numerous. Offa made a grant of three hundred and sixty-five mancusses—one for each day in the year—to be disposed of by the pope for pious uses; a grant which was afterwards converted into an annual tax upon the English nation, and imperiously demanded by the pontiffs of Rome as a lawful tribute and a mark of subjection of the kingdom of England to the papal sway.

One event which took place at this period greatly accelerated the ambitious designs of the Romish church. This was the invasion of the Danes. By their ruinous ferocity the decline of learning and piety among the Anglican clergy was rapidly hastened. On every hand the monastic establishments were destroyed, and the natural result of their destruction was a relapse towards barbarism. Alfred, that "mirror of princes," by dauntless and unsubdued courage relieved the land from this scourge for a season, and did all that he could for the restoration of learning and piety, but his task was almost hopeless. At his accession to the throne, not a single priest could be found who understood the Latin language which he daily mumbled before the people. On restoring peace to his country, one of his first cares was to repair the ruined churches and monasteries, and even to build new ones; but many of the English monks had perished, and he was compelled to bring others from the Continent to supply their places. Some who had fled from their monasteries for fear of the Danes, returned and took possession of their livings and lands, but many of these had married in their retreats, and on their return brought their wives and children with them, so that at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century the abbeys of England were generally possessed by a secular or married clergy; a circumstance which subsequently gave occasion to violent contentions in the Anglo-Saxon church. In truth, when the monastic system began to revive, its resuscitation was attended with convulsions that threatened the destruction of the nation.

The tenth century, commonly called "the age of lead," was the most dark and dismal period of that long night of ignorance in which Europe was involved after the fall of the Roman empire. Some faint rays of knowledge had illuminated the end of the last century, but these were now succeeded by an almost Egyptian darkness. This arose from the wars occasioned by a disputed succession; the frequent revolts of the Danes in England, and the

invasions of their kinsmen of the north. In the midst of these commotions it is no wonder that the interests of religion and learning were neglected; that superstition usurped the place of piety in more than an ordinary degree; and that Rome, taking advantage of these circumstances, rapidly advanced towards the long-coveted throne of supremacy.

The master spirit of this age was Dunstan, a man who, as Le Bas observes, has done more than any other individual that can be mentioned to inflict upon mankind the curse of a suspicion that priestcraft and religion are one. The history of superstition, indeed, can scarcely present another name so infamous for barefaced abuse of vulgar credulity, and for a prodigal application of the grossest machinery of imposture. His progress from his cell at Glastonbury to the primacy of England, and his actions and conduct as primate, is one perpetual series of atrocity and fraud. He sowed the dragon's tooth.

> "His thoughts, his dreams,
> Do in the supernatural world abide;
> So vaunt a throng of followers filled with pride,
> In what they see of virtues pushed to extremes,
> And sorceries of talent misapplied."

The character and actions of this remarkable man have been recorded in previous pages. From those pages the reader, on referring back to them, will see that Dunstan's sole aim was to render the papal power absolute in the Anglican church. In this attempt he was supported by King Edgar, that weak monarch who was ever ready to do his bidding. By the aid of Edgar he overpowered the resistance which the country had long maintained against papal dominion, and gave to the monks an influence for evil, the baneful effects of which were experienced till the time of the Reformation. From the time of Dunstan to the reign of Henry the Eighth "the man of sin" swayed the Anglican church with a high hand.

As Le Bas observes, however, the works of even this architect of evil were not to last. The Danes renewed their incursions, and the religious establishments fell, as usual, before their ferocity. These barbarians, indeed, finally conformed to the religion at this time prevailing in England; but their conformity was generally marked with insolence and profanity. Canute may have been a sincere convert to Christianity, but not so was the mass of his Danish subjects. The Saxon clergy were almost converted into menial slaves. Often did their haughty and savage conquerors compel them to celebrate the services of the altar not only in their private houses, but in their very chambers where they reposed side by side with their wives or concubines. Happy was it for them and the nation at large that the Norman conqueror swept these barbarians from the shores of England. The Anglican clergy, however, bowed down as they had been by the Danes, retained sufficient spirit to provoke and embarrass the conqueror. They sternly opposed his rule, but William was not to be borne down by ecclesiastics. He had power, and he used it in proportion to their haughtiness. As will be seen in future pages, his crown never obeyed a cowl. He even stood erect before the mighty spirit of Hildebrand himself, who demanded that he should do fealty for his kingdom to the see of Rome, that kingdom which he had won by his prowess and his good sword. The pope had consecrated a banner under which he was to fight for that kingdom, but he never intended to do fealty for it to a haughty priest. He won it for himself, and not for the pontiff of Rome. His proud spirit could not brook such humiliation; he hurled defiance at the chair of St. Peter.

The success of Dunstan and his coadjutors in promoting the erection and endowment of monasteries and nunneries was fatal to the interests of the country. By it a spirit of irrational and unmanly superstition was diffused among the people, which debased their minds and diverted them from nobler pursuits. Such were the multitudes that devoted themselves to the cloister, that above a third of the lands of England fell into the hands of those who paid no taxes and owed no military service. And what was the character of the religion taught by the monastic order at this later period of the Anglo-Saxon rule? Some particulars of this may be gathered from "the Canons of King Edgar," probably framed by Dunstan, and "the Canons of Archbishop Elfric." From the former we gather that the priesthood combined some trade with their sacred calling. Every priest was commanded to learn some trade and to teach it to all his apprentices for the priesthood. There was no great harm in this, for St. Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, wrought at his trade of tent-maker, but there is no mention of the divinity taught by the monks. They were to be very earnest in exhorting the people to pay honestly all their dues to the church, and at the proper time. They were to pay their plough alms fifteen nights after Easter; their tithes of young animals at Pentecost, their tithes of corn at All Saints, their Peter pence at Lammas, and their church-scot at Martinmas. The priests were also to be very diligent in weaning the people from the worship of trees, stories, and fountains, and from other pagan rites in which they were still prone to indulge. They were also required to impress upon penitents the necessity of confessing all their sins, whether committed in their skin, their bones, their flesh, their sinews, their veins, their gristles, their tongues, their lips, their palate, their teeth, their hair, their marrow; by everything soft or hard, wet or dry. Penances for laymen were numerous, and to be enjoined most emphatically. They were to desist from carrying arms, to make long pilgrimages; they were never to stay two nights in the same place, never to cut their hair or pare their nails, or go into a warm bath or a soft bed, or eat flesh or drink strong liquors; and if they were rich they were to build and endow churches. Long fastings of several years were to be enjoined for certain offences, but a year's fasting might be redeemed for thirty shillings, equal to 4*l.* 10*s.* of our money, so that the rich especially did not suffer much from abstinence. A rich man who had many friends and dependents, indeed, might despatch a seven years' fast in three days, by procuring eight hundred and forty men to fast for him during that period on bread and water and vegetables. The Canons of Ælfric, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from A.D. 995 to A.D. 1005 were certainly purer

than those of Edgar, but they were far from being in accordance with the Gospel. Ælfric was one of the most learned men of his age, and a voluminous writer, having translated eighty sermons or homilies from the Latin into the Saxon language, in order that the clergy might read them to the people for their instruction. But Ælfric had been educated by Ethelwald, who with Oswald had aided Dunstan with all their might in establishing the monastic institutions, and was deeply imbued with the principles of these three famous prelates. Despite all the efforts of Dunstan, priests still married; and the first eight of Ælfric's canons denounced the practice, energetically but not logically. By a ninth canon the clergy were even forbidden to be present at a marriage, and to give their benediction if either of the contracting parties had been married before. The next seven canons describe the names and offices of the seven orders of the clergy—namely, the Ostiary, the present sexton, who had to open and shut the door and to ring the bells; the Lector, who read God's word in the church; the Exorcist, who drove out evil spirits by invocations and adjurations; the Acolyth, who held tapers at the reading of the gospels and celebrating mass; the Sub-deacon, who brought forth the holy vessels and attended the deacon at the altar; the Deacon, who ministered to the mass-priest, placed the oblation on the altar, read the gospel; baptized children, and gave the eucharist to the people; and the Mass Priest, who preached, baptized, and consecrated the eucharist. Of the same order as the mass priest, but higher in honour, was the bishop. Other canons regulate the time for singing the seventide songs, define the books with which the clergy were to provide themselves; and enjoin upon them the duty of explaining the gospel every Sunday in English to the people, and of teaching them the creed and paternoster. Priests were always to have oil by them, consecrated by the bishop for the baptism of children and anointing, and particular directions were given them about the celebration of mass and other ceremonies; among which it was enjoined upon them to see that the people kissed the cross on Good Friday. As some of the clergy at this period had superstitiously conceived that the sacramental bread consecrated on Easter day was more efficacious than that which was hallowed at any other time, this practice was condemned by Ælfric's canons, because it was "apt to grow stale, to be lost, and eaten by mice." Priests were also directed to mix water with the sacramental wine, "because the wine betokened man's redemption through Christ, and the water the people for whom he suffered." Finally the canons of Ælfric commanded several fast days to be observed—such as every Friday, as from Easter to Pentecost, and from mid-winter to Twelfth Night—and defined the length of the Sabbath, which was to be kept from noon Saturday to Monday morning. Subsequently, Canute, who was a zealous Christian, according to the fashion of the age, promulgated several ecclesiastical laws, the general character of which resembled those of the above canons; by which the reader may learn what was the nature of the religion as established by law in England when it fell under the Norman rule.

It was an age of ignorance and superstition. Evidences of this are clear in the frequency of pilgrimages to Rome, the sums expended in the purchase of relics, and the great wealth and immunities enjoyed by the clergy. At this period, the roads from England to Rome were crowded with pilgrims, and the princes through whose territories they passed reaped a golden harvest from the tolls exacted from them. As for the traffic in relics, the pope and Roman clergy were enriched by it beyond all precedent. Fragments of the cross, legs and arms of the apostles, and toes and fingers of more modern saints, were at a premium. It is related that Agelnoth, archbishop of Canterbury, when at Rome, A.D. 1021, purchased from the pope an arm of St. Augustin, bishop of Hippo, for which he gave one hundred talents, equal to sixty pounds' weight of gold. It was an enormous sum; but it was no doubt a profitable speculation, for the superstition of Saxon England would well repay him for the sight of such a relic. As for the building, endowment, and adornment of monasteries, the wealth of the kingdom was swallowed up in their expenditure. As an instance of the extravagant profusion displayed at this period, William of Malmesbury says that "the masses of gold and silver which Queen Emma, with a holy prodigality, bestowed upon the monasteries of Winchester, astonished the minds of strangers, while the splendour of the precious stones dazzled their eyes."

It was an age also of sensuality and profligacy. Shall we lift the veil from those holy retreats where kings and princes and nobles retired, as the monkish chroniclers relate, after a life spent in ambition and crime, to end their days in penitence and devotion? Was it true penitence? and was it genuine devotion? There is too much reason to believe that these devotees retired into monasteries and nunneries for a far different purpose. The Council of Clovesho, held A.D. 747, found it necessary to direct that the monasteries should not be turned into places of amusement for harpers and buffoons; and that laymen should not be admitted therein too freely, lest they might be scandalised at the offences committed therein. That was among the clergy themselves; but it is on record that at a later period, nobles who devoted their wealth to heaven, and founded religious houses on becoming abbots, gathered around them a brotherhood of dissolute monks, with whom they lived in the commission of every vice, of which they had every opportunity, inasmuch as most of the monasteries of England were double houses, in which resided communities of monks and nuns: we lift the veil no further, lest we should shock the minds of our readers.

It was also an age of bitter religious contentions. There was a schism in the body. There was a deep-rooted jealousy on the part of the ancient clergy towards the regulars, by whom they had been supplanted. There were heartburnings between them, adverse not only to religion itself, but to the church to which both parties belonged. The very architecture and ornaments of the churches built at that period, relics of which exist to this day, bespeak the rancour which existed between the schismatics. Satirical caricatures of the monks may be seen in spouts of the roof, labels of windows, and figures on

columns in Saxon-built churches, and on some of the painted glass of our cathedrals. It is also marked in our early literature. If the seculars satirized the monks in sculpture and painting, the monks satirized them with their pen. Thus, Rudborne, a monk of Winchester, relates, that so long as the canons, or the secular clergy, were in possession of the church of Winchester, no notice was taken of the remains of St. Swithin, no miracles were wrought at his grave; but no sooner were the monks in possession, than they carefully deposited his honoured bones within the cathedral, in a case of silver and gold, and miracles became abundant. He meant this as a reproach to the canons; but it may be inferred, from the terms of the reproach, that they were in reality more honest than the monks. But the secular clergy, though more illiterate, as a body, than the monks, had among them those who could use the pen as a weapon of warfare, with equal skill as their figures in burlesque. Langland, who was a secular priest as well as a satirical poet, in his Vision of Pierce Plowman, lashes the regulars or monks with no unsparing hand: holding up to posterity their artifices to procure endowments, their love of pleasure, their luxury, their horses, hawks, and hounds, with a pen graphic in the extreme, but deeply dipped in gall. Nor was it in figures and words alone that the canons and regulars warred with each other. It was their pleasure to thwart one another in deeds as well as figures and words. If the monks got possession of a cathedral of which the bishop had been promoted by the secular clergy, they behaved towards him in a spirit of "untamed reluctance." Their opposition was so stern on some occasions, that some of the bishops, irritated thereby, ventured to fill up their places with their old friends the canons, who "were ever ready to obey their diocesans."

During this long period, those ancient Britons who preserved their civil liberty, preserved also their religious independence, none of them being in communion with, or in subjection to, the Anglican church, so that they still preserved their ancient usages from the innovations imported from Rome. The history of the Church of Scotland is involved in considerable obscurity; it appears clear, however, that there was no communion between the Churches of England and Scotland; and that from the time when their members differed about the observance of the festival of Easter, there was a violent animosity existing between them. It is certain, indeed, that the Scottish church was preserved from the errors of Rome, and that they were instructed and governed by their own clergy. These clergy, who were called Culdees, were a kind of presbyters, living in small societies, and travelling over the territory north and south of the Grampians, preaching and administering the sacraments. Of their doctrines and ecclesiastical government very little is known: but whatever they may have been, they were diametrically opposed to those inculcated by the Romish priesthood. On this account, although a great part of the north of England had been converted by Culdee missionaries, the council of Cealhythe decreed, in the year 816, that no Scottish priest should be allowed to perform his spiritual functions in England for the future. The chief reasons assigned by the council for refusing to keep communion with the Culdees, were that they had no metropolitans amongst them; that they paid very little regard to other orders; and that it was not known by whom they were ordained, whether by bishops or not. It is not clear, indeed, whether at that time there were bishops among them, properly so called, although in their several communities there was one who superintended the rest, and directed their several missions. Subsequently, when their cells or monasteries in which they lived came to be enlarged, and better endowed, the Culdees, or secular clergy, had the privilege of choosing the bishops, in those places whore bishop's sees were established; as that of St. Andrews, which was founded in the ninth century. Later in the period, the bishops of St. Andrews, although not raised to the rank of archbishops and metropolitans, appear to have had pre-eminence over the other bishops of Scotland, probably from their greater wealth and their greater influence with the Scottish princes. But the grand feature of the Scottish church at this period was that it maintained its own creed, worship, and discipline, utterly rejecting the Romish ceremonies, doctrines, and traditions which had been so universally introduced into the Anglican church. It was the exclusive devotedness of the Culdees to the authority of Scripture, and their opposition to the doctrines and practices of the Romish priesthood, that called forth the decree of the council of Cealhythe against them; but while they were thus denounced as schismatics, some of the writers of that period bear honourable testimony to the purity of their lives and their zeal in preaching the gospel.

CHAPTER IV.

The History of Literature, Science, and Art, from A.D. 449 to A.D. 1066.

Language.—ACCORDING to some writers, the Anglo-Saxon language was the most ancient and most excellent of all known tongues. This may be hyperbole, but it is certain that its origin cannot be traced, and that it was so excellent and copious, that at the period now undergoing review, it enabled those who spoke it to express their ideas with force and perspicuity. It must not be supposed, however, that the Anglo-Saxon language continued in the same state throughout the whole of this period. On the contrary, the language from which the modern English is derived appears to have been formed about the time of

Egbert, when the three great tribes—Jutes, Angles, and Saxons—became consolidated into one people, and when their dialects coalesced to produce one speech. The Anglo-Saxon language, as thus developed, was one of the earliest cultivated languages of modern Europe. It was the first employed in the literature of the period, whether of prose or of poetry. From that period it passed through the successive stages of semi-Saxon, Old English, and Middle English, until at length it reached that state of perfection in which our books are now written and our thoughts expressed: for although the modern English possesses a classical element, out of about 38,000 radical words and derivatives in our vocabulary, 23,000 are of Saxon origin, the remainder being derived from the Greek, Latin, Arabic, French, and other languages. That the language used by our most popular authors is pre-eminently Saxon, has been proved to demonstration by Mr. Turner, who in selected passages from Shakspeare, Milton, Cowley, Thomson, Addison, Spenser, Locke, and Pope, shows that the Anglo-Saxon words used in these passages are six to one on an average to those derived from other sources.

Learning and Literature.—At the period when the Saxons invaded England they were in a state of barbarism; and the Britons, who had under the Romans studied the Latin language, soon became almost as barbarous as their Saxon invaders. Learning had languished before their arrival; but where their arms prevailed, the last sparks of it were well-nigh extinguished. During the whole of the sixth century, there does not appear to have been one person in England possessed of any degree of literary fame, so utterly did they sweep all learning and science from the land. What glimmerings of knowledge there were in this century must be looked for in the mountains of Wales and Caledonia, whither the Britons fled from the sword of the Saxon. Among the authors of this period was Gildas the historian, the only author of the sixth century whose works are still published. He was so much admired in that age, that he obtained the appellation of "Gildas the Wise;" but his history is only valuable for its antiquity. As regards Columba, a learned monk and writer of the sixth century, antiquaries differ as to whether he was born in Ireland or Scotland, but there appears to have been two of that name; the one born in Scotland being educated in the famous monastery of Iona. Columba went from Iona into France, where he founded a monastery at Besançon, in which station he was attacked by Pope Gregory for observing Easter at a different time from the Church of Rome, in defence of which practice he wrote several letters and tracts. But the learning cultivated by the British and Scotch clergy during this century was of little value, as it was only a smattering of the Latin language, polemical divinity, and ecclesiastical law.

After the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, learning began to revive in England. The first Christian king in England was the first English legislator who committed his laws to writing: and when Sigebert, king of the East Angles, was converted, he founded, A.D. 630, a school in his dominions for the education of youth The torch of knowledge was therefore at this period rekindled in England, and was destined never again to be utterly extinguished. Among the great patrons of learning in the seventh century, Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, takes the first rank. As the most effectual means of promoting religion among the Saxons, Theodore brought with him a valuable collection of books, and several professors of the sciences to aid him in the education of the Saxon youth. Among these professors was Adrian, abbot of St. Augustin's, in Canterbury. It was under his tuition that Adhelm, a relative of Ina, king of the West Saxons, who rose to literary fame, was educated. Adhelm became famous for his learning, not only in England but in foreign countries. He was the first Saxon who wrote in the Latin language, both in prose and verse, and so celebrated was he as a writer, that many learned men on the Continent sent their writings to him for correction. Bede says that "he was a man of universal erudition, having an elegant style, and being well acquainted with books both on philosophical and religious subjects." Adhelm became abbot of Malmesbury, the monastery of which he founded, and afterwards bishop of Sherburn. It is related of him, that when abbot, he composed a number of little poems, which he sang to the people after mass, whereby they were gradually instructed and civilized. According to Bede, a great number of scholars were daily instructed by Theodore and Adrian in the sciences, and that they read lectures to them on poetry, astronomy, and arithmetic, as well as on divinity and the Holy Scriptures. The same authority states, also, that he had conversed with some of their scholars, who understood Latin and Greek as well as their native language. In the course of this century, several monasteries were founded, to each of which a school was attached for the education of youth. It was in one of these seminaries that Beda, or Bede himself, on whom the name of "venerable" has been justly bestowed, was educated.

In Wales and Scotland learning remained much the same as it had been in the sixth century. Among those who flourished in this period was Dinothus, abbot of Bangor in Flintshire, who is said to have been a man of great eloquence and learning, for which he was chosen by the British clergy to be their advocate in a conference with Augustin, archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 601. Contemporary with him was Nennius the historian, who is said to have been one of the monks of Bangor, from the massacre of whom, A.D. 613, he escaped; after which he wrote his History of the Britons. After the destruction of the famous monastery of Bangor, which had been a kind of university for the education of the British youth, learning greatly declined among the posterity of the ancient Britons. From this time, indeed, but few names appear in the annals of learning and literature in Wales or Scotland during the whole of this period.

In the eighth century the torch of knowledge almost everywhere became dim. Upon the whole it seems to have been the most dark and dismal part of that long night of ignorance and barbarism that succeeded the fall of the Roman empire. The state of learning on the Continent was deplorable.

Nations appeared to have been fast sinking into a savage state, and to have been in danger of losing the small remains of learning that had hitherto existed among them. In Spain canons were made against ordaining men priests or bishops who could neither read nor sing psalms, and when Charlemagne began to attempt the restoration of learning in France, A.D. 787, the study of the liberal arts had ceased, and he was obliged to bring men of letters from other countries. This decline of learning on the Continent was chiefly owing to the incursions of the Saracens in France and Spain, and the establishment of the Lombards in Italy. Even in Rome, the seat of learning, the light of science was on the point of expiring, for the pretended literati wrote in the most barbarous manner, without any regard to the rules of grammar. In truth, at this period the only science which the Romish clergy studied with care was music: to be the best singer was to be esteemed the most learned man.

This decline of learning on the Continent, however, contributed to its advancement in England. Many learned men found an asylum in the British island, and were instrumental in promoting learning among its people. This, together with the results of the schools established in the previous century by Sigibert, Theodore, and others, occasioned a gleam of light to arise in England in the eighth century; of no great brilliancy indeed, but still of considerable lustre when compared with the darkness by which it was preceded and followed. Among those who flourished in this century was Tobias, Bishop of Rochester, who was chiefly educated under Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and who is said to have written several works in the Greek and Latin languages, all of which perished in the subsequent depredations of the Danes. The Anglo-Saxon name, however, most distinguished in literature is that of Bede.

The "venerable Bede" was born at Wearmouth, in Northumberland, A.D. 672, and was educated in the monastery of that place called St. Peters, which was founded by the famous Benedict Biscop, one of the most learned men and the greatest traveller of his age. Bede enjoyed great advantages in this monastery for the acquisition of knowledge, having the use of an excellent library collected by its founder in his travels, and the assistance of the best masters then living. He was ordained deacon in the nineteenth year of his age by Beverley, Bishop of Hexham, about which time he removed to the monastery of St. Paul's at Jarrow, near the mouth of the River Tyne, then newly founded by Biscop. In that monastery Bede spent the remainder of his life in the services of the church, and in the work of education and authorship. At the age of thirty he was ordained priest, but though he contented himself with living as a simple monk, the fame of his learning spread all over Europe, and the sovereign pontiff is said to have been desirous of his company and advice in the government of the church. Pope Sergius, indeed, wrote expressly for him to come to Rome; but Bede remained at Jarrow, where he died A.D. 735, leaving works behind him which have escaped the general wreck, and have been published in different cities of Europe; the most complete edition, in eight volumes folio, being that issued at Cologne A.D. 1612. Among those works are an ecclesiastical history of England; commentaries on the books of the Old and New Testament, and the Apocrypha; two books of Homilies, and a Martyrology. Bede has been rightly called, not only the most learned of all the British monks, but at the age in which he lived of the whole western world. His greatest blemish was his credulity and faith in the legendary tales of the cloisters, which he has interwoven in the pages of his history; but it must be remembered that he lived in an age when it required more than human strength and sagacity to rise superior to its superstitious notions.

After the death of Bede the decline of learning in England was remarkable. A few of his surviving friends—as Acca, Bishop of Hexham, and Egbert, Archbishop of York, both of whom were good scholars and generous patrons of learning—supported the declining interests of scholarship; but their efforts were vain to stem the tide of ignorance then spreading over the land. Later in the century Alcuin, Abbot of Canterbury, flourished as an orator, philosopher, and divine, and composed many treatises on various subjects in an elegant and easy style. He, indeed, was one of those learned men whom Charlemagne induced to settle in his court, and he became that monarch's tutor in the sciences: France, in truth, is said to have been indebted to him for all the polite learning it boasted of in that and the succeeding age.

The decline of learning in England has been attributed by some historians solely to the death of Bede, but there were other causes more potent in producing this change; particularly the frequent civil wars, and the destructive ravages of the Danes, who destroyed the monasteries, burnt their libraries, and slew or dispersed the monks abroad. To what a deplorable state learning was reduced may be gathered from the pen of the great King Alfred. On his accession to the throne in the ninth century he says that all learning and knowledge were extinguished in the English nation, insomuch that none south of the Thames, and but few south of the Humber, understood the common prayers of the church, or were capable of translating a single sentence of Latin into English. By Alfred's exertions a better state of things was brought about. His reign is a memorable period in the annals of Anglo-Saxon literature. Inspired with the love of learning himself, he sought to encourage its growth among the people. He founded a school, considered as the origin of the present university of Oxford, to the support of which he devoted one-eighth of his whole revenue.

The reign of Alfred affords more materials for literary history than two or three centuries either before or after. It shines out with all the lustre and warmth of the brightest day of summer, amidst the gloom of a long, dark, and dreary winter. In his intervals of rest from warfare, he gathered around him learned men from various districts. One of the most remarkable of these was the Welsh monk Asser, who may be termed his loving biographer. "I

came," says Asser, "into Saxony—England—from the extreme limits of western Britain, summoned by the king. After I had set out, I arrived through many wide intervening ways in the country of the south Saxons, which is called in Saxon Suthseaxe—Sussex—guided by some of that nation. There I first saw him in the royal vill called Dene"—probably East or West Dean near Chichester—"and after being kindly received by him, in the course of conversation he earnestly entreated me to devote myself to his service, to give myself wholly up to him, and for his love to relinquish all my possessions on the other side of the Severn. He promised to compensate me richly, and he actually did." Asser would not then forego his cloister, but after some delay it was agreed that he should pass half his time in it and half at court. Returning at length to Alfred, the monk found him at Leonaford, and he remained constantly with him, conversing and reading with him all such books as the king possessed. Asser says, "I translated and read to him whatever books he wished which were within our reach; for it was his peculiar and perpetual custom day and night, amidst all his afflictions of mind and body, either to read books himself, or to have them read to him by others." So diligently did Alfred pursue his studies, that he became one of the most remarkable teachers of his age. No one ever devoted himself to the labours of authorship with greater earnestness, and a higher sense of duty, than did King Alfred. Among the productions of his pen was a translation of Bede's Ecclesiastical History; an "Epitome of Orosius;" the Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan; and an original account of the geography of Germany in the ninth century. Both his original works and his translations—which are numerous—exhibit considerable scholarship, and they are the more remarkable when it is considered that he not only wrote in the midst of much bodily and mental suffering, but amidst the heavy cares devolving upon him in the administration of his government.

In prosecuting his studies, Alfred had a twofold object in view—his own and his people's improvement. Among the other learned men whom he invited to his court besides Asser was Grimbald, a monk of Rheims in France, who was famous for his theological and ecclesiastical learning and skill in church music. John Scot, another learned man of the age, was procured from old Saxony on the continent, and Phlegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, Wereferd, Bishop of Worcester, Wulfig and Ethelstan, Bishops of London, and Werebert, Bishop of Chester; all assisted him in his studies and in his endeavours to promote the interests of learning among his subjects. The work which Alfred and his coadjutors had before them was one of great magnitude. Scarcely a monastery, or a bishop's seat, where schools had been kept for the education of youth, chiefly for the church, had been left standing by the ruthless and Goth-like Danes; but Alfred repaired the walls of those in ruins, and built new ones, and instituted a school in each of them whereby learning was revived. At all events youth were taught reading, writing, the Latin language, and church music, to fit them for performing the public offices of the church. Some were likewise taught arithmetic, to enable them to manage the secular affairs of their societies, while others were instructed in rhetoric and theology, to enable them to teach the people by their oratory. Such was the usual routine of education at this period both in England and on the Continent, but though it was calculated to prevent the total extinction of literary knowledge among the clergy, it contributed but little to the improvement of science, or to diffuse learning among the laity. Still Alfred did what he could to diffuse learning among the laity as well as the clergy. Education was made by him the road to preferment, not only in the church, but in the state. He was a living example of its benefits, and he was constantly recommending it to his subjects. He even legislated on the subject, for by one of his laws, all freeholders who possessed two hides or more of land were compelled to send their sons to school, and give them a liberal education. It would appear, indeed, from the old chroniclers that learning flourished so much under his auspices, that before the end of his reign every bishop's see was filled by a prelate of learning, and every pulpit in England furnished with a competent preacher. Asser has finally put it on record that the old nobility, ashamed of their ignorance, in several instances applied to study at an advanced age, incited thereto by the example and precept of King Alfred.

But the gleam of light which appeared in England towards the close of the ninth century, and which was chiefly owing to Alfred's extraordinary genius and efforts, was not of long continuance. After his death, in the very first year of the tenth century, learning began to languish and decline. His son and successor Edward had been educated with great care, but not having the same genius and taste for study as his illustrious father, he did not prove so great a patron of learning, and learned men. Even if he had been, it is probable that he would not have been able to have preserved the lamp of knowledge in England; for no sooner had the Danes heard of the death of their invincible conqueror than they renewed their destructive ravages. The learned men, also, whom Alfred had gathered round him, dying soon after their royal patron, were not succeeded by men of equal talent and learning. These and other unfavourable circumstances gave a fatal check to the progress of learning, so that by degrees the English relapsed into their former ignorance. All the nations of Europe, in truth, became in the tenth century involved in the most profound darkness, whence it has been said that this age, for its barbarism and weakness, was the age of iron; for its dulness and stupidity the age of lead; and for its blindness and ignorance the age of darkness. It was almost destitute of men of genius and learning: was productive of few great princes or good prelates; and scarcely anything was performed in it meriting the attention of posterity. Some who filled the highest stations in the church were not able to read, and others who pretended to scholarship, and attempted to perform its public offices, often committed the grossest blunders. It is true that Dunstan is said by monkish chroniclers to have ranked only second to Alfred as a promoter of learn-

ing, and to have been a prodigy of learning himself, but little credit can be given to their encomiums. It was the fashion of the monks of the middle ages to exalt the character of Dunstan without regard to truth or probability. The only man who flourished in England at the end of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh, as a man of learning and literature, was Elfric the grammarian, who translated from the Latin into the Saxon tongue eighty sermons or homilies for the use of the clergy, and composed several other works; and who, by the reputation he had gained, was finally advanced from the degree of a simple monk to the archiepiscopal dignity.

In the few first years of the eleventh century, the state of learning in England was in the most deplorable condition. In the year 1009, Oxford was reduced to ashes by the Danes, and Cambridge soon after shared its fate. The greatest part of the monasteries, churches, cities, and towns in England fell a prey to their ravages during this calamitous season. In the reign of Canute, however, learning is said somewhat to have revived. According to Anthony Wood, that monarch was anxious to repair the injuries which had been committed by his countrymen; and lamenting the low state to which learning was reduced, founded schools in many places for its revival. It seems probable that he repaired those at Oxford, and restored them to their former privileges and revenues. But what Canute did was undone by his barbarian son and successor, Harold. An enemy to all learning, Harold plundered the university of Oxford of its revenues, and thought that he treated the scholars with lenity when he left them the naked walls of their houses. The restoration of the ancient line of Anglo-Saxon kings, A.D. 1041, in the person of Edward the Confessor, was favourable to the cause of learning and literature. Edward repaired the injuries which had been done to Oxford by Harold; and, according to Ingulphus, it was at that period the chief seminary of learning. Ingulphus was himself chiefly educated at Oxford, where, according to his own testimony, he made great progress in the Aristotelian philosophy, and became acquainted with the rhetoric of Cicero. The father of Ingulphus lived in the court of Edward the Confessor; and he relates, that when he visited him at court, he was often examined in Latin and logic by Queen Editha, who excelled in both those branches of literature; a proof that learning was then esteemed a fashionable accomplishment among ladies of the highest rank, and that at the close of this long, dark, and dreary period, learning had in some degree revived. It was, indeed, the dawn of a brighter day; for soon after the Norman conquest events happened which contributed greatly to promote the interests of learning and the spread of knowledge among the English nation.

> "Now at last the sacred influence
> Of light appears, and from the walls of heaven
> Shoots far into the bosom of dim night
> A glimmering dawn."—*Milton.*

Poetry.—Among the arts held in high favour by the Anglo-Saxons, that of poetry takes the first place. It was very early cultivated by them. They brought their passion for it with them from the north; for at this period the mountains of Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and even Iceland were the seats of the muses. Every bold warrior, when he engaged in a piratical or military expedition, if he was not a poet himself, had a poet attendant to celebrate his martial deeds. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the leaders of the several armies of Saxons, Angles, Jutes, and Danes who came to our island, brought with them poets to sing their exploits and victories.

The exact laws of the metres of the Anglo-Saxon poets are unknown. Their poetical compositions resemble the Runic odes imitated by Gray, and are marked by alliteration, by a mixture of regular and irregular cadence, by abrupt transitions, by an omission of particles, and by an artificial inversion of words and phrases. It is only at a late period that there is any approach to rhyme exhibited in the Anglo-Saxon poetry.

But whatever merit the poetry of this period possessed, it obtained for those who composed it a high degree of popularity. Kings themselves were as ambitious of the laurel as of the crown. Alfred employed his poetic talents to enlighten the minds and civilize the manners of his subjects, and Canute occasionally courted the muses. Poets were the chosen favourites of many of the Saxon monarchs. They were entertained at their feasts, advanced to honours, and loaded with presents. So profuse was the patronage bestowed upon them, that one poet declared, by a poetic licence, that if he had desired of his prince the moon for a present, he would have bestowed it upon him. The poets of the north especially enjoyed the royal favours, and they were so numerous that an antiquary has observed that it would be endless to name them. So great was the power of poetry over the rude minds of the age, that it is said it was able to subdue the fiercest outbursts of anger and revenge. One of the most ancient of these bards has put this boast on record:—"I know a song by which I soften and enchant the arms of my enemies, and render their weapons of none effect. I know a song which I need only to sing when men have loaded me with bonds; for the moment I sing it my chains fall in pieces, and I walk forth at liberty. I know a song useful to all mankind; for as soon as hatred influences the sons of men, the moment I sing it they are appeased. I know a song of such virtue, that were I caught in a storm I can hush the winds and render the air calm." This is the language of hyperbole, but that the ancient bards acquired an ascendency over the rude minds of the Anglo-Saxon population there can be no question. And this proves that they must have possessed the true poetic fire, for no mere art could have exercised such influence. One of these poets of nature is mentioned by Bede. This Saxon poet was a monk named Cædmon, who lived in the seventh century. It is related that the most sublime strains of poetry were so natural to this ancient bard, that he dreamed in verse, and composed his most admirable poems in his slumbers; repeating them when he awoke. This may be fiction; but Cædmon appears to have been possessed of that divine enthusiasm with which a true poet is always inspired. According to

Bede, he was a sacred poet: the first of that long list which has adorned our literary annals. "He sung," writes Bede, "the creation of the world; the origin of mankind; the whole history of the book of Genesis; the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt; their taking possession of the land of promise; and many other scripture histories. He sung of the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour; of the giving of the Holy Ghost and the preaching of the Apostles. In a word, he composed poems on the divine blessings and judgments; on the terrors of the last day; on the joys of heaven; the pains of hell; and on many other religious subjects, to deter men from the love of vice, and excite them to the love and practice of virtue." All the poems of Cædmon are lost except a portion of one, which is preserved in King Alfred's Saxon version of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History." Indeed this fragment, "On the Origin of Things," is one of very few specimens existing of early Anglo-Saxon poetry. It reads thus:—

Nu we sceolan herian	Now must we praise
Heofon rices weard	The Guardian of heaven's kingdom,
Metodes mihte.	The Creator's might,
And his mod-gethone	And his mind's thought;
Wera wuldor fæder	Glorious father of men.
Swa he wundra gehwæs	As of every wonder he,
Ece drichten.	Lord eternal,
Oord onstealde	Formed the beginning.
He ærest gesceop	He first framed
Eorthan bearnum	For the children of earth
Heofon to hrofe	The heaven as a roof;
Halig scyppend	Holy creator.
Tha middangeard	Then—mid-earth,
Moncynnes weard	The guardian of mankind,
Ece dryhten	The eternal Lord,
Æfter teode	Afterwards produced;
Firum foldan	The earth for men,
Frea Ælmihtig	Lord Almighty.

The alliterative and syllabical harmony displayed in this fragment of ancient Saxon verse, runs through the whole of the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons. This mode of versification continued to be used by the poets of England long after this period, as in the visions of Piers Plowman, published about the middle of the fourteenth century. The following specimen, for instance, deviates but little from the common song of the Anglo-Saxon poets:—

In a somer season,
When hot was the sun,
I shope me into shroudes,
As I a shepe were;
Inhabit as an harmet,
Unholy of werkes,
Went wyde in this world
Wonders to heare.

The Anglo-Saxon poetry was capable of almost endless variations by changing the length of the verses, the number and position of sonorous letters and syllables, and by other artistic methods. It was in this that the great charm of Anglo-Saxon poetry consisted. One of the chief means of multiplying their modes of versification was the regard paid to long and short syllables, after the manner of the poets of Greece and Rome. For this, their language was much better adapted than the modern English, as it had not so great a proportion of words of one syllable, and as its quantities were much better fixed and ascertained. On this subject it has been remarked, "The kind of verse in which they most delighted was the Adonian—consisting of one long, two short, and two long syllables—though they sometimes deviated a little from the strict rules of that measure. For as the Greek and Latin poets, when they wrote Iambics, did not always adhere to the strictest laws of that kind of verse, but made use of various liberties; so the Anglo-Saxon and Dano-Saxon poets allowed themselves equal liberties in composing their Adonics." And it is of Adonics that the greater number of the Anglo-Saxon verses now extant consists. In that measure they composed their religious hymns, their poems in praise of saints, their war songs, their songs of love, their satires, their elegies of sorrow, and their glees of mirth and festivity; for the subjects of Anglo-Saxon poetry were as various as their rules of versification.

A grand feature in Saxon and Danish poetry is its figurative and metaphorical language. But the figures and metaphors used were not the productions of individual genius, like those of modern poets; on the contrary, they were established by ancient and universal practice. Many of the figures were taken from the ancient Pagan theology and mythology of the northern nations. The profusion of metaphors and figures with which the Saxon and Danish poetry abounds, coupled with the very involved arrangement of the words—some of which are only used in verse—renders it almost unintelligible to modern readers, though, probably, it was sufficiently clear to contemporaries.

Notwithstanding the marked difference of language, the versification of the bards of Wales and Scotland bore a strong resemblance to that of the Saxon and Danish. Their modes of versification were various and alliterative, and their language metaphorical. During the sway of the Romans the poetic genius of the provincial Britons had been depressed, but it was not destroyed. When the Roman yoke was broken, and they had regained their liberties, they reached their harps down from the willows on which they had so long been suspended. During their fierce wars with the Saxons their poetic genius not only revived, but shone forth all its meridian splendour, for it is on record that some of the most famous Welsh poets flourished during this period.

Music.—Music was very early cultivated by the Saxons. It was a natural accompaniment to their Adonic verse. The two arts were inseparable and universal. The halls of kings, princes, and nobles rang with the united melody of the poet's song and the harp of the musician. Most commonly the poet and musician were blended in the same person; for blessed at once with a poetical genius, a tuneful voice, and a skilful hand, the Saxon poet sang and played the songs which his genius composed. It was this combination of talent that procured even the meanest among them riches, honour, and regal favour. But music appears to have been the study of the age. History records that Alfred excelled in it, as did also Anlaff, the Danish King of Northumberland. Skill in vocal and instrumental music, indeed, appears at one period a necessary accomplishment to every man who wished to mingle in courtly society. According to

Bede, it was the custom for every one present at a feast to sing and play on the harp in order to increase the festivity of the company. The art of playing on the harp was also practised professionally by wandering minstrels and gleemen. But the harp of the Anglo-Saxons was a rude instrument of music compared with the elaborately-constructed harp of the moderns. In an illuminated manuscript the psalmist David is represented as playing on a harp of a square or oblong shape with ten strings, which he plays upon with his right hand while he holds the instrument with his left. In another instance the royal psalmist is represented playing a harp of triangular form, which has eleven strings; and it may be concluded that these two kinds of harp were those in use among the Anglo-Saxons. The harp appears to have been highly prized; and the persons of those who could play upon it were esteemed inviolable, and secured from injuries by severe penalties. But this was not the only instrument of music among the Anglo-Saxons. A great variety of wind and stringed instruments are mentioned by writers of this period; such as bells, horns, trumpets, drums, cymbals, viols, and the lyre. This latter instrument is represented in illuminations as having four strings, which were played upon by a plectrum. The tabor, pipe, flute, and violin are also mentioned as instruments of music in use at this period; and Bede and Adhelm both mention the organ. According to William of Malmesbury, a great many organs and bells were given by

MUSIC BELLS.

Dunstan to the churches of the west; the former of which he describes as having brass pipes and bellows. It is doubtful whether the organ mentioned by Bede was anything more than an instrument composed of reeds, and blown with the mouth—the mouth organ of the present day; but it is certain that organs with brass pipes and bellows were in use at a later date. Aylwin is said to have erected an organ of that description in Ramsey Abbey, at a cost of 900*l.* of our present money.

The music of the Anglo-Saxons is scarcely entitled to the name of a science; musical notation being then unknown. Yet that it was not contemptible is clear from Bede, who speaks of it as being the most laudable, pleasant, joyous, and amiable of all the arts; as purifying and delighting the human heart; as dispelling sorrow, alleviating care, improving joy; and as promoting the health of the body as well as the happiness of the mind. The most wonderful effects are ascribed to the music as well as to the poetry of

HAND ORGAN.

the age; although the effects were probably the natural and happy union of these sister arts rather than to the intrinsic value of either. But the fullest and most distinct notices of Anglo-Saxon music that have reached our times refer to church music, which appears to have been cultivated with ardour. Able masters from Rome taught it in England, and many youths were sent to Rome for instruction in church music. One of the most celebrated of these foreign teachers was John, Archanter of St. Peter's at Rome, who was sent by Pope Agatha, A.D. 678, to teach the monks of Wearmouth, and other English monks, the art of singing the public service after the Roman manner. Another famous teacher was Putta, ordained by Archbishop Theodore, chiefly, it would appear, from his being well instructed in church discipline, and "well seen in song and music to be used in the church, after the manner as he had learned of Pope Gregory's disciples." Putta was ordained Bishop of Rochester, and when his church had been destroyed in a hostile incursion made into Kent by the Mercian King Ethilfred, he obtained a small cure and a portion of ground from Servulf, Bishop of Mercia, and went about the country giving instruction in music and singing. At a later period church music was one of the chief branches of learning taught in a seminary established at Canterbury, from whence professors were sent to teach the art in monasteries throughout England. It is related of Canute that as he was rowing upon the Neve, the choral hymn burst upon his ears from the monastery of Ely, which so enchanted him that he wrote a ballad in praise of the

merry monks, the first verse of which is still preserved. It reads thus:—

"Merrily sang the monks within Ely
When that Cnute king rowed thereby:
Row my knights, row near the land,
And hear we these monks sing."

Architecture.—Perhaps nothing suffered more from the invasion of the Saxons than the Roman architecture of Britain. Some of the structures erected during the Roman period were built with so much solidity, that they might have remained to this day, had they been preserved with care; but the Saxons came in the twofold character of invaders and destroyers. Like all the nations of Germany, they had been accustomed to live in houses of wood or earth, and covered with branches of trees or straw; and hence, having no taste for the arts, they wantonly demolished the noblest structures, however beautiful might have been their architecture. Their conquest was accompanied by wide-spread destruction of tower and temple, of castle and villa. As regards architecture, the Roman presence in our island was almost wholly effaced by these barbarian invaders.

For nearly two hundred years the Saxons lived in England, as they had done in Germany, in houses of nearly as rude a construction as the wattled houses of the early Briton. Their very temples were erected of wood: so utterly ignorant were they of the art of masonry. Even after their conversion to Christianity, their cathedrals were built with the same perishable material. Bede says, that there was a time when there was not a stone church in the land: all being erected with wood and covered with reeds. The first chapel or oratory erected by Edwin, King of Northumberland, A.D. 672, was timber-built; and the cathedral of Lindisfarne, or Holy Island, was built with oak and covered with thatch. The cathedral of York, however, founded by Edwin at his baptism, appears to have been erected with stone; as was the church built by Paulinus, the Archbishop of York, in the city of Lincoln. Of this church, Bede says, that its walls were standing in his time, though the roof had fallen in; and that some healing miracles were wrought in it every year, for the benefit of those who had the faith to seek them.

As a mark in the progress of arts in the seventh century, it is related that Bishop Wilfrid glazed the windows of the cathedral of York, A.D. 669; the glass used being brought from the continent. A few years later, A.D. 676, the abbot Biscop brought artisans into this country from France, skilled in the art of making glass. The honour of restoring masonry in England, chiefly belongs to Wilfrid and Biscop, who were great travellers, and had acquired a taste for the arts at Rome. Wilfrid, who was one of the most wealthy prelates of his age, was a great builder, for he erected magnificent structures at York, Ripon, and Hexham. The cathedral of Hexham, built by him, is said to have been the most beautiful on this side of the Alps; having a lofty roof, supported by pillars of polished stone, long and high walls, and sublime towers. This edifice was erected by artificers brought from Rome, and probably France, as were all the erections at this date. The benedict Biscop, however, induced those artificers which he brought from the continent to settle in England. Biscop erected the magnificent abbey of Wearmouth, and other structures, and his artificers are said to have taught the English the arts in which they were so skilful: especially that of making glass for windows, lamps, drinking vessels, and other uses.

Stone buildings, however, were of very rare occurrence during two centuries after Wilfrid and Biscop flourished; nor does it appear that glass became at all common. Windows of houses and churches were still for the most part filled with fine linen cloth, or lattices of wood, as heretofore. When Alfred the Great, towards the end of the ninth century, formed the design of building his ruined cities, churches, and monasteries, and of adorning his dominion with more magnificent structures, he still had to employ foreign artificers. Asser says, that he employed an almost innumerable multitude, collected from different nations, many of whom excelled in their several arts. It seems probable, however, that Alfred's buildings were generally more remarkable for their number and utility than for their grandeur. We are told, indeed, that the wind whistled so rudely through his own palace, that he was compelled to contrive the manufacture of a horn lantern, to preserve the flickering flames of his candle from being blown out, while he was pursuing his studies. Long after his time, almost all the houses, and the greater number of the churches and monasteries, were erections of wood, covered with thatch. The truth is, the Anglo-Saxon nobility had still no real taste for magnificent buildings, and were content to live in low, mean, and inconvenient dwellings. This may have been owing in a great measure to the unsettled state of the country, and the frequent depredations of the Danes; but still there must have been a general want of taste in architecture, otherwise there would have been more structures of a solid character erected than history leads us to believe there were. Even the few solid structures that were erected, appear to have been only rude imitations of the Roman style of architecture, for the most admired of the Saxon churches were low and gloomy: their walls being immoderately thick, and their windows few and small, with semicircular arches at the top. Their most general form was, probably, that of the smaller parish churches of a later date, consisting of a simple nave and chancel, although some may have been built with side aisles.

The most numerous ecclesiastical edifices were erected in the reign of Edgar the Peaceable, in the tenth century; who, under the influence of Dunstan and his coadjutors, founded many monastic establishments, which were increased in number by private munificence. It was at this period that Aylwin the Ealdorman founded the Abbey of Ramsey, in Huntingdonshire: a church which is said to have had two towers raised above the roof; one at the west end, and the other, which was larger, supported by four pillars in the middle of the building, where it divided into four parts, being connected together by arches, with other adjoining arches, in order to secure their stability.

The narrative of the circumstances attending the foundation of the Abbey of Ramsey, as related by

Sharon Turner, from the "History of the Monks of Ramsey," gives us a clear insight into the manner in which monastic institutions were established at this period. At that time, the people were taught to believe that those who renounced the world brought blessings on their country, and they were urged to found such institutions, and to labour in their erection. It was thus that Aylwin was instructed by Bishop Oswald, and he readily acted upon the bishop's exhortation. "The Ealdorman replied, that he had some hereditary land surrounded with marshes and remote from human intercourse. It was near a forest of various sorts of trees, which had several open spots of good turf, and others of fine grass for pasture. No buildings had been upon it, but some sheds for his herds who manured the soil. They went together to view it. They found that the waters made it an island. It was so lonely, and yet had so many conveniences for subsistence and secluded devotion, that the bishop decided it to be an advisable situation. Artificers were collected; the neighbourhood joined in the labour. Twelve monks came from another cloister to form the new fraternity; their cells and a chapel were soon raised. In the next winter, they provided the iron and timber and utensils that were wanted for a handsome church: in the spring, amid the fenny soil, a firm foundation was laid. The workmen laboured as much for devotion as for profit. Some brought the stones; others made the cement; others supplied the wheel machinery that raised the stones on high; and in a reasonable time the sacred edifice, with two towers, appeared on what had been before desolate waste."

It is to these circumstances, connected with the foundation of Anglo-Saxon churches, that Wordsworth thus refers in one of his ecclesiastical sonnets:—

> "By such examples moved to unbought pains,
> The people work like congregated bees;
> Eager to build the quiet fortresses
> Where Piety, as they believe, obtains
> From heaven a general blessing: timely rains
> Or needful sunshine; prosperous enterprise
> And peace and equity."

After all, architecture, even at the latest period of the Saxon rule in England, was very imperfect; and the few erections of any note were from examples on the continent, and not from the designs of any native genius. Thus the famous church of St. Andrew, at Hexham, erected by Bishop Wilfrid, was a copy of the Roman Basilica, founded by Constantine, as is clearly proved by the description given of it by Prior Richard. He says, "The foundations of this church St. Wilfrid laid deep in the earth: for the crypts and oratories, and the passages leading to them, which were then with great exactness contrived and built underground. The walls, which were of great length, and raised to an immense height, and divided into three several stories or tiers, he supported by squares and various kinds of well-polished columns. Also the walls, the capitals of the columns which supported them, and the arch of the sanctuary, he decorated with historical representations, imagery, and various figures in relief, carved in stone, and painted with a most agreeable variety of colours. The body of the church he compassed about with pentices and porticoes, which both above and below he divided with great and inexpressible art by partition walls and winding stairs. Within the stair-cases, and above them, he caused flights of steps, and galleries of stone, and several passages leading from them, both ascending and descending, to be artfully disposed that multitudes of people might be there and go quite round the church, without being seen by any one below in the nave. Moreover, in the several divisions of the porticoes, or aisles, both above and below, he erected many most beautiful and private oratories of exquisite workmanship; and in them he caused to be placed altars in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, St. Michael, St. John the Baptist, and the holy Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and Virgins, with all decent and proper furniture to each of them: some of which remaining at this day, appear like so many turrets and fortified places."

Of the domestic architecture of this period no minute description can be given. The same may also be said of the military architecture. It would appear, however, that several towns of the Anglo-Saxons, as Oxford, Exeter, Warwick and others, were strongly fortified with walls. Exeter is said to have defied the Norman conqueror for eighteen days, and even then the citizens surrendered only because their chiefs proved traitors to the Saxon cause. The resistance made in these fortified towns was so stern that it provoked the utmost vengeance of the conqueror.

Architecture among the posterity of the ancient Britons during this long period, appears to have been in a far more imperfect condition than in England. After they retired to the mountains of Wales the art appears to have been almost wholly lost. The chief palace of the Kings of Wales, where the nobles and wise men met to enact laws, was called the "White Palace," because its walls were woven with white wands, which had the bark peeled off. According to the Leges Wallicæ, whoever burnt or destroyed the King's palace, was compelled to pay one pound and eighty pence, and one hundred and twenty pence for each of the eight adjacent buildings; namely, the dormitory, the kitchen, the chapel, the granary, the bake-house, the store-house, the stable, and the dog-house. It is evident that all the buildings of Wales were of wood only, for the laws required the King's vassals to come to the building of the castles erected for the security of the country with one tool only—the axe.

The state of architecture in Scotland, in the former part of this period, was similar to that in Wales. At a later date, however, the Scots and Picts appear to have practised the art of masonry. There are still some stone buildings of a singular construction and great antiquity to be seen in some parts of Scotland, which appear to have been the works of different ages and different nations. All these buildings are of a circular form, and some of them, as that in a valley called Glenbeg, were of great magnitude. Other circular towers were not so large, and were more artificial in their architecture. They were slender and lofty: being about forty feet only in external circumference, and from seventy to a hundred feet high. They are said to have consisted

of five or six stories; and it has been supposed that they were erected for the confinement of penitents while performing penance. Penitents, it is said, were first placed in the uppermost story, from whence they descended by degrees until they came to the door, which was some feet from the ground, where they received absolution from the clergy and the blessings of the people. Other writers, however, imagine that the design of these circular towers was to enable the clergy to call the people to church by the sound of a horn or trumpet blown from the top; but as they were always erected in the neighbourhood of churches, it may be that they were used for both purposes.

Sculpture and Painting.—At the time of their settlement in this island, the Saxons cultivated the art of sculpture. Nations who worship images naturally encourage those who have any taste or genius for making them. Doubtless, therefore, our Saxon ancestors had images of their gods in their temples, though they may have been carved in a rude and clumsy style. There is evidence on record that they had idols or statues of their imaginary deities; for it is recorded, that when they were converted to Christianity they destroyed them. The art of making them was then deemed impious; but it was soon revived. For as the Pagan Saxons had images of their gods in the temples, so the Christian Saxons, following the example of Rome, had images of saints in their churches. At first these images were brought from Rome, but as the demand increased they were supplied by native art. But their sculpture, like their architecture, was rude and imperfect, as at this period it was also in France and Italy. There was no Phidias who could put life into marble.

In painting there appears to have been a greater degree of skill displayed. Like sculpture, its sister art of painting was chiefly employed in the decoration of churches. The first paintings were brought from Rome; but as the veneration and demand for the pictures of saints increased, native art was called into existence. Many natives, and especially among the clergy, studied the art of painting in order to furnish their churches with these ornaments. Dunstan, who seems to have been a universal genius, was esteemed by his contemporaries a skilful painter; and one of his productions, a picture of Christ, with himself at his feet, is still preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. That the Anglo-Saxons had arrived to a considerable degree of perfection in the art of painting is proved by many illuminated manuscripts still in existence. The most enduring monuments of the Anglo-Saxons, indeed, are these manuscripts and illuminations, which were produced by the clergy in their cloisters, and which we may yet open in our public libraries, and gaze upon with admiration. The art flourished from the eighth to the eleventh centuries, and it was practised by the greatest dignitaries of the church as well as monks, some of whom are styled "painters." Painting was evidently the most flourishing art of the period, and it was brought to greater perfection than almost every other art. Portrait-painting was even practised to a considerable extent; and historical painting, or representations of the principal actions of great princes and generals, was attempted, although such paintings do not possess any great merit, being deficient in outline and colour. It is supposed by some that the art of colouring and painting on glass was practised by the Anglo-Saxons, but there are no known remains of that art in existence. At the same time, among receipts for performing various works of art as practised in the eighth century, which are preserved in a work entitled "Vitæ Ælfredi," there are directions for staining glass in various colours, in order to form figures and pictures of mosaic work.

CHAPTER V.

The History of Industry, Commerce, etc., from A.D. 449 to A.D. 1066.

Agriculture. — IT has been seen that in the time of the Romans agriculture was brought to such perfection, that not only was sufficient corn produced for home consumption, but that our island afforded great quantities for exportation. Like everything else, however, with the declension of the Roman power it declined, and when they had left its shores, became almost wholly destroyed. Harassed by the incursions of the Picts, Scots, and Saxons, the British husbandman had no heart for labour, for the fruits of it were quickly destroyed. Hence lands hitherto fruitful became as deserts. When, however, the Saxon invaders had become dominant, agriculture revived. Self-preservation is the law of nature, and hence they applied themselves to the cultivation of the soil. But our Saxon ancestors considered agriculture too mean an employment for themselves: that was committed wholly to women and slaves.

On this subject Sharon Turner writes:—"When the Anglo-Saxons invaded England, they came into a country which had been under the Roman power for about four hundred years, and where agriculture, after its more complete subjection by Agricola, had been so much encouraged, that it had become one of the western granaries of the empire. The Britons, therefore, of the fifth century, may be considered to have pursued the best system of husbandry then in use, and their lands to have been extensively cultivated with all those exterior circumstances which mark established proprietorship and improvement: as small farms; enclosed fields; regular divisions into meadow, arable, pasture, and wood; fixed boundaries;

planted hedges; artificial dykes and ditches; selected spots for vineyards, gardens, and orchards; connecting roads and paths; scattered villages and larger towns; with appropriate names for every spot and object that marked the limits of each property, or the course of each way. All these appear in the earliest Saxon charters, and before the combating invaders had time or ability to make them if they had not found them in the island. Into such a country the Anglo-Saxon adventurers came, and, by these facilities to rural civilization, soon became an agricultural people. The natives, whom they despised, conquered, and enslaved, became their educators and servants in the new arts which they had to learn, of grazing and tillage; and the previous cultivation practised by the Romanized Britons will best account for the numerous divisions and accurate and precise descriptions of land which occur in almost all the Saxon charters."

The Saxon princes and nobles, who in the division of the conquered lands obtained the largest shares, are said to have divided their estates into two parts—the In-lands and the Out-lands; the former being those lying contiguous to their dwellings, which were cultivated by slaves, under the direction of bailiffs, for the use of their households; and the latter let to ceorls, or farmers, at a given rent, which was occasionally paid in kind. The value of these rents was fixed by law, according to the number of hides or plough-lands of which a farm consisted. Thus it is said that by the laws of Ina, King of the West Saxons, a farm consisting of ten hides paid the following rent: ten casks of honey, three hundred loaves of bread, twelve casks of strong ale, thirty casks of small ale, two oxen, ten wethers, ten geese, twenty fowls, ten cheeses, one cask of butter, twenty pounds of forage, five salmon, and one hundred eels. In some cases rents were paid in wheat, rye, oats, malt, flour, hogs, sheep etc., according to the nature of the farm and the custom of the country. It was in this manner that the greatest part of the crown lands were farmed by the ceorls, although it would appear that money-rents were not unknown at this period. The farms of this period, however, did not consist of arable lands solely. On the contrary, as Stow observes, the Saxon farmers may be considered graziers rather than ploughmen, as almost three parts of the kingdom were set apart for the feeding of cattle. A considerable part of each estate was also woodland, the timber on which was protected by law; so that the lands in cultivation, properly so called, formed but a small proportion of the estates held by the Saxon kings and their nobles.

As regards the state of agriculture at this period, it would appear that it was very imperfect. This is proved not only by the lowness of rents, but the low value of land. The ordinary price of an acre of the best land, for instance, in the vicinity of Ely, was sixteen Saxon pennies, or about four shillings of our present money, as proved by Dr. Gale in his history of the church of Ely, founded by Ædelwold, and enriched by many a broad acre purchased by other benefactors in the reign of Edgar. But the imperfect state of cultivation at this period is demonstrated more forcibly by the frequent famines which occurred; famines which from time to time carried off a great number of people. These famines may in part have occurred from the small quantity of lands cultivated—as frequently not more than a fifth or sixth portion of a farm was sown with corn; but it is evident that they chiefly arose from the slovenly and superficial manner in which the lands were tilled. Much of this imperfect state of cultivation arose not only from want of skill but from positive indolence. The only seasons of exertion were seed-time and harvest; the modern operations of weeding, hoeing etc., all necessary for the production of good harvests, being unpractised. And even their ploughing and sowing seems to have been very unskilfully performed: the operations being carried on by slaves, who had but little interest in their success. According to an Anglo-Saxon manuscript, which contains a series of sketches illustrative of the operations of husbandry, the season of ploughing was January; and if the frost was severe, the labour may be supposed to have been deferred to the months of February or even March. The plough was drawn by four oxen —the use of horses being prohibited—attended by a driver; and it consisted of an iron coulter and share attached to the end of a beam. The seed was scattered by a man who followed the plough, and was at once deposited in the new-made furrow. There were no harrows used to cover the earth over the seed; but the ploughman carried in his hand a plough beetle to break the clods as he went along. The labours of seed-time do not appear to have been over before April, in which month the landowner is represented in the manuscript as regaling his friends with horns of ale. It is singular that the harvest is represented as commencing in June, though it does not appear to have been finished before August—the month in which almost all the corn in the present day is garnered. After the harvest, the Anglo-Saxon manuscript represents the lord and his attendants as hunting the wild boar or sporting with hawks, and the husbandman as repairing his instruments. The corn appears generally to have been threshed in December or in the winter months; and when winnowed, or sifted from the chaff, it was carried in large baskets to the granary: an overseer or steward taking an account of the quantity by notches cut on a tally. The corn was converted into meal by grinding it in handmills turned by females, during a great part of this period; but towards its close, water and windmills, which had long been known to the Visigoths in Spain and the Longobards in Italy, became general among the Anglo-Saxons.



HANDMILL.

In lands belonging to the Church, a somewhat better system of cultivation appears to have existed. Church lands were better cleaned, and the quantity of waste land was smaller. The monks themselves often turned cultivators; nor were abbots above the humble occupation. Bede, in his "Life of the Abbots of Wearmouth," says of Easterwin, that being a strong man, and of a humble disposition, he used to assist his monks in their rural labours: sometimes guiding the plough by its stilt or handle, sometimes winnowing corn, and sometimes forging instruments of husbandry with a hammer upon an anvil.

In gardening, the monks were very skilful for the age. In their gardens they produced figs, grapes, nuts, almonds, and pears. They were also skilful in ornamental planting: herbs and shrubs being planted round the monasteries, as well as fruit trees. Brithnod, the first abbot of Ely, is said to have been so skilful in the art of gardening, that he laid out very extensive gardens and orchards round his monastery, which he filled with so many herbs, shrubs, and fruit trees, that in a few years the trees which he planted and grafted, appeared at a distance like a wood, which greatly added to the beauty of this religious retreat.

The Useful Arts.—Among the Anglo-Saxons, trades were pursued by the servants of a family, by travelling artisans, and by those who settled in cities, towns, or villages, to carry on trade on their own account. On their arrival in Britain they were acquainted with the most essential branches of the clothing arts; such as dressing wool and flax, spinning them into yarn, and weaving them into cloth. The material for clothing was chiefly the product of household industry. Female domestics were employed in the art, nor did those of the highest rank disdain to handle the distaff and loom. It was thus that the daughters of Edward the Elder occupied their leisure hours; and Alfred termed the female part of his family in his will "the spindle side." Nor was this work, from at least the seventh century, of an ordinary character. There is distinct evidence that the arts of weaving various figures of men, animals, flowers, foliage, &c., into cloth, or of embroidering them upon it after it was woven, were known. Adhelm, Bishop of Sherburn, about A.D. 680, distinctly alludes to the art of embroidery. Writing in praise of virginity, in order to show that it was not chastity alone that constituted the virgin, he illustrates his observation by this simile from the art of weaving:—"As it is not a web of one uniform colour and texture, without any variety of figures, that pleaseth the eye and appears beautiful; but one that is woven by shuttles, and filled with threads of purple and many other colours, flying from side to side, and forming a variety of figures and images, in different compartments, with admirable art." Sometimes the figures in embroidery were worked with threads of gold and silver, and sometimes with silk of various colours; the principal being purple, yellow, green, blue, pea-green, red, and lilac. One of the most remarkable works of embroidery belonging to this period is that of the Bayeux tapestry, which is a pictorial illustration of the conquest of England by William Duke of Normandy; beginning at the visit of Harold to the Norman court, and ending with his death at the battle of Hastings. On this splendid piece of embroidery, which is sixty-seven yards in length, there are several hundreds of figures—men, horses, birds, trees, houses, castles, churches, ships, &c.—all executed in due proportions and appropriate colours, with inscriptions over them to elucidate the events and scenes the tapestry pictorially describes. The work is ascribed to Queen Matilda, the wife of the Conqueror, but the greatest part of it was probably performed by Saxon needlewomen, for it is especially recorded that they were so famous for needlework and embroidery that their manufactures were called *Anglicum opus* or English work.

The art of dyeing was known among the Britons, but it would appear that it received considerable improvement during this period; and especially the art of dyeing scarlet; that dye being discovered from an insect of the cochineal species about A.D. 1000. Silk was worn by the wealthy, but there is no evidence that it was of Saxon manufacture; but only linen and woollen cloths. The furrier's art, or the art of dressing the skins of animals without taking off the hair or wool, was brought to considerable perfection; for furs of all kinds became fashionable, and were much valued for their warmth and beauty. Several articles of dress, as shoes, ankle leathers, and leathern hose, were derived from the art of the tanner; an art which also contributed to the manufacture of several articles for domestic purposes.

The handicrafts of the carpenter and blacksmith were held in high esteem among the Anglo-Saxons. Of the skill of the carpenter and the cabinet-maker at this period little is known; but it would appear that it was of no mean order, for it is on record that the edifices constructed of beams of wood and boards were some of them very beautiful; the material being most exactly joined and highly polished. That these artificers were numerous is evident, as it was by them that various kinds of furniture, arms, and tools were made, as well as ships and all kind of edifices both public and private. But the smith was held in higher esteem than the carpenter; inasmuch as he greatly contributed to the defence of the Saxons in war. He fabricated their swords and their armour, and every military officer had his smith to keep his arms and armour in order. The chief smith was an officer of considerable dignity in the courts of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs; receiving an ample remuneration for his services, and enjoying many privileges. But besides these smiths, there were others who worked for the public, for it is recorded that in the reign of Edward the Confessor there were six smiths' forges in the city of Gloucester.

The most skilful artificers, however, in the metallic and other arts were attached to the monasteries. Proficients of the superior departments of art were everywhere found in the cloisters and their precincts. Here were illuminators, and architects, and workers in gold and silver; and here, also, were carpenters, smiths, shoemakers, millers, and bakers. The ecclesiastics themselves were the most skilful workers in metals—Dunstan being the most famous of them all. He is said to have been the best blacksmith, brazier, goldsmith, and engraver of his time. Many trinkets made by him were long preserved in the

church as relics, and as objects of veneration. Among the articles manufactured by these ecclesiastical artificers were bells, images, crucifixes, gold and silver cups, gold dishes, silver basins gilt, gold rings, silver mirrors, and bracelets. Some of the works executed in gold and silver at this period were ornamented with precious stones. Many a curious casket adorned with gold, silver, and precious stones contained the relics of saints in the cathedrals and churches. It would appear, also, that the art of gilding was known; for Stigand, Bishop of Winchester, is said to have made a large crucifix, and images of the Virgin Mary and the Apostle John, which he adorned, together with the beam on which they stood, with gold and silver, and to have set them up in his cathedral for the public adoration.

Commerce.—It might have been supposed that the Saxons, who had been for ages a navigating race, would on their settlement in England have become a great commercial people; that having obtained their island stronghold they would have fortified it by securing the dominion of the surrounding seas, and made it the centre of a great commercial empire. The sea had been their favourite element, and navigation the art in which they most delighted and excelled. But a change came over their habits. No sooner had they formed settlements in our island than they abandoned the watery element; either destroying their ships or leaving them to rot in the harbours. For nearly two centuries they had but little commercial intercourse with any of the continental nations, and that little was chiefly carried on by foreigners. During that period the chief commercial port was London, which Bede says was frequented by merchants of several nations, who came to it both by sea and land on account of trade. It would appear from this that the Anglo-Saxon merchants at that time took their goods to London, where they were met by foreign merchants, who came thither by sea to purchase these goods with money, or to exchange other goods for them which they had brought with them from the continent. But although the Saxons at first neglected commerce they were destined to lay the foundation of a commercial empire which in our days extends over the whole of the known world.

It was towards the close of the eighth century that the foundation of this colossal empire was laid. At that time English commodities were carried abroad, and probably some of those on the continent brought to England in ships of native construction. The oak of the forest was again felled to brave the tempest and the breeze. Pilgrims to Rome appear to have been the first to engage in foreign trade, together perhaps with some who found it convenient to confess themselves pilgrims for the purposes of gain. This was in the time of Offa, King of Mercia, who encouraged his subjects to fit out ships for foreign commerce. It is probable that Offa, in thus encouraging ship-building had in view also the extension of his dominions. At all events, the other princes of the Heptarchy suspected that he had such a motive: for, dreading his power and ambition, they applied to Charlemagne of France for his protection against Offa. This led to mutual retaliation between Charlemagne and Offa; both treating each other's merchant subjects in their respective ports with unjust severity. For a time there was a stop put to all commerce between their dominions; but the breach was healed and was succeeded by a commercial treaty; the first that was ever entered into between England and France. In this treaty, which was entered into about A.D. 795, the following article was inserted:—"All strangers who pass through our dominions to visit the thresholds of the blessed apostles, for the love of God and the salvation of their souls, shall be allowed to pass without paying any toll or duty; but such as only put on the habit of pilgrims, and under that pursue their traffic and merchandise must pay the legal duties at the appointed places. It is also our will that all merchants shall enjoy the most perfect security for their persons and effects under our protection and according to our command, and if any of them are oppressed and injured let them appeal to us and our judges, and they shall obtain the most ample satisfaction." It would appear from this that the profession of pilgrimage had been made a cloak for smuggling. The practice no doubt gave an impulse to trade, but it was illegal, and although Offa endeavoured to obtain the consent of Charlemagne to allow all who travelled through his dominions to pass unsearched, he was not able to carry his point. The luggage of these pretended palmers were rigidly overhauled by Charlemagne's collectors of customs, and if they were found to contain any merchant goods, they were either seized or their owners were heavily fined. It seems probable that these smugglers wearing the garb of pilgrims were Jews—for there were some of that race then settled in England—and it has been conjectured, that the goods in which they dealt were articles of gold and silver; those articles of English manufacture being already held in high repute all over the continent.

From this time down to the reign of King Alfred but little is known of the foreign commerce of the Anglo-Saxons. Commerce, however, appears still to have been carried on, not only between the different states of the Heptarchy, but between England and continental nations. Both, however, were on a very limited scale, and under many restraints. Thus, according to the laws of Kent, if any of the people of that state purchased anything in London which was situate in the adjoining state of Essex, it was necessary that two or three honest men, or the chief magistrate of the city should witness the transaction. Similar restraints were laid upon exchanging one commodity for another. No one was allowed thus to barter except in the presence of the sheriff, the mass priest, or the lord of the manor; if they did, they were liable to a fine of thirty shillings, and to have their goods so exchanged seized, the forfeited goods passing into the hands of the lord of the manor. The object of these regulations was to ascertain the terms of all bargains, so that if any dispute arose sufficient evidence might be obtained to direct the judges in their determinations, as well as to prevent imposition, and the sale of spurious and stolen articles. But though trade was under these burdensome restraints, other laws promoted it. Thus markets and fairs were allowed to be held at certain places throughout the kingdom. At first the weekly markets were held on

the Sabbath, and commonly in the churches; but it was afterwards ordained that they should be held, not in but near the churches, on the day preceding the Sabbath. Besides weekly markets there were great commercial meetings held at some places, on fixed days of the year, near some cathedral, church, or monastery. These meetings were always held on the anniversary of the dedication of the church, or on the festival of the saint to whom it was dedicated, and as the bishops and abbots were allowed by charter to take toll from those who attended them, they could not have chosen a better season for the enrichment of their revenues than when the people crowded from all parts to these festivals.

Such was the general character of trade and commerce among the Anglo-Saxons between the reigns of the great Offa and the still greater Alfred. The reduction of the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy was favourable to commerce generally: to the internal trade, by putting an end to war between state and state; and to foreign commerce, by making the English monarchy an object of greater importance to foreign merchants. But for some time there was a drawback to these favourable circumstances. In the ninth century the Danes covered the narrow seas with their fleets, and seized every merchant ship that fell in their way, and when they landed, when and where they pleased, and plundered the coasts and sea-ports, foreign commerce was almost wholly destroyed. When, however, Alfred became victorious over these marauders commerce revived. Its extension was one of the leading objects of his administration. To this end he cultivated an intercourse with foreign nations, and encouraged foreigners that were in his service and some of his own subjects to undertake voyages for making discoveries, and opening up new sources of trade, both in the north and south. He is said to have corresponded with Abel, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who sent him many valuable presents; and to have sent an embassy to the Christians in India, from whom he received aromatic liquors and splendid jewels in return for his courtesy. But the interest Alfred took in hearing of the more remote parts of the earth is more distinctly shown in his own account of the voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan: the former of whom appears to have visited Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden; and the latter to have navigated the Baltic as far as to "the land of Estum," the present Prussia. As proofs of his visit to the north seas, Ohthere brought back with him "horse-whales" and rein-deer; and in his account of the Eastland visited by Wulfare, he says that it was very large; that it abounded in honey and fish; and that its kings, of which there were many, and its rich men drank mare's milk, and the poor and the slaves mead.

Other means were adopted by Alfred to extend foreign commerce. He introduced new manufactures and furnished many articles for exportation; and repaired the sea-ports which had been ravaged by the Danes. The chief means, however, by which he promoted foreign commerce, was the improvements made by him in the art of ship-building. His ships, says the Saxon Chronicle, were neither like those of the Danes nor those of the Frisians, but were of a construction far more serviceable. They were twice as long as the æscas of the Northmen, and they were not only longer and higher, but they were swifter and less unsteady in sailing. Some of them had sixty or more oars; and it is clear that they were better adapted either for war or commerce than the ships of any nation of the period. By the improvement Alfred made in naval architecture he raised the naval power of England greater than it had ever been before; and it is evident, from the superior splendour of his court, and the greater abundance of money, and foreign commodities that were then in the country, commerce had been during his reign greatly extended by his exertions and example.

The example set by Alfred was closely copied by his son and successor Edward, but still more so by his grandson Athelstan. Athelstan made foreign trade the road to honour as well as wealth. It was enacted by him—no doubt with the consent of his Witan—that every merchant who made three voyages over the sea with a ship and cargo of his own should be advanced to the rank of a thane. One can hardly conceive the impetus which such an enlightened and liberal enactment must have given to foreign trade. Still further to encourage and facilitate commerce, Athelstan established mints in various towns in England, where foreign trade was of any importance, in order that merchants might have an opportunity of converting the bullion received for their goods into coin without much expense or trouble. From these and other regulations, such a spirit of trade was excited, and the shipping and seamen so much increased, that Athelstan maintained the dominion of the sea, and compelled the Danish and Norwegian princes to court his friendship.

Little was done during the brief reigns of Edmund, Edred, and Edwy for the extension of commerce; but the spirit that had been awakened continued to operate, and the naval power and commerce of England to increase. Edgar who succeeded Edwy raised a greater fleet than any of his predecessors. The monkish chroniclers represent that he had between three and four thousand ships: but this statement must be received with caution; for, in return for Edgar's benefactions to the Church, the historians of the cloisters were too prone to exalt his character and power at the expense of truth. It is evident, however, that Edgar possessed the largest fleet of any Saxon monarch before him, and that his ships were so well ordered and commanded that he effectually protected his kingdom, and the commerce of his subjects.

Large as Edgar's fleet might have been, it evidently did not amount to the number of ships furnished by landed proprietors, A.D. 1008, in obedience to a law enacted by Ethelred. In consequence of that law, the Saxon Chronicle relates that a great fleet of near eight hundred ships was raised, which was greater than any that had ever been seen in England. This plainly disproves the statement that Edgar possessed some three or four thousand, and gives rise to a suspicion that his monkish followers added a cipher to the latter number. During the reign of Ethelred several laws were enacted for the security of the persons, ships, and effects of merchants when driven into English harbours by stress of weather, or wrecked upon the coasts; laws which prove that his subjects were prone

to habits of plundering, and that the legislature was desirous of encouraging foreign trade. Other laws enacted at Wantage in Berkshire, by Ethelred and his Witan, declared that every smaller boat arriving at Billingsgate in the port of London, should pay for custom one halfpenny; a larger boat with sails one penny; and a keel, now called a hulk, four pennies. A vessel with one piece of timber, and a boat with fish coming to the bridge, was to pay a halfpenny or a penny, according to its size. From these laws it would appear that there were certain German merchants called the "Emperor's men," who, when they came with their ships, were declared to be worthy of good laws; that is, they were to be treated with favour. At the same time they were to pay custom, and were not to forestall the market to the prejudice of the Londoners. The custom or dues paid by the "Emperor's men"—who were probably representatives of some trading company afterwards, called "merchants of the steelyard"—were two pieces of grey cloth, one piece of brown cloth, ten pounds of pepper, five pairs of gloves, and two casks of wine. These dues were paid twice a year—at Christmas and Easter. It is worthy of record, also, that a commercial treaty was entered into between Ethelred and the princes of Wales, by which a court was constituted consisting of six English and six Welsh lawmen, who were to determine all disputes that should arise in commercial transactions between the two nations. This appears to have been the first time that the descendants of the Ancient Britons had any friendly intercourse with their old enemies the Saxons, since the period of the conquest, for the animosity that was engendered by their bloody conflicts, was too violent hitherto to admit of mutual intercourse. Time, however, had now so far softened the resentment of the Britons for the injuries they had received, as to bring about at least a brief reconciliation with their Anglo-Saxon supplanters.

During the Danish invasions commerce was greatly impeded, but under the Danish rule it again revived. Canute afforded considerable encouragement to trade and commerce. Some of his ships were especially retained to protect the trade and coast of England, and he employed his influence in procuring favours and privileges to his trading subjects from foreign princes. While at Rome he negotiated a commercial treaty with the Emperor Conrad II., and Rodolph III., the last King of Arles, in which he obtained many privileges for English merchants in their dominions. Under his rule the trade of England flourished greatly, and English merchants, especially those of London, acquired great weight and influence in the public councils of the kingdom. It was in his reign that the result of the law of Athelstan, respecting the thane-ship of merchants, was developed; for at the death of Canute it is recorded that the seamen of London were, at the assembly of nobles who met at Oxford when Harold was chosen king of all England. These seamen were no doubt such as had made three voyages beyond seas, and had thereby acquired a legal title to the dignity of thanes. Both Harold and Hardicanute appear to have generously promoted commerce; and the restoration of the Saxon line, in the person of Edward the Confessor, made no change of consequence, either in the naval power or commerce of the kingdom, which at the time of the Norman conquest was in a flourishing condition.

The English exports of this period were not very numerous. As in the time of the Britons, slaves continued to form one of its most valuable articles. They were carried out of the island and exposed to sale in all the markets of Europe: that of Rome being the great emporium for slave-dealing. Prisoners taken during the wars of the period afforded a fruitful supply of slaves for the continental markets. Nor was it prisoners of war only that were sold for slaves. The people of Northumberland and Bristol were accustomed to sell their nearest relations for slaves down to the very end of this period. Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester at the Norman conquest, appears to have preached down this practice at Bristol. In his life it is recorded:—"You might have seen with sorrow long ranks of young persons, of both sexes and of the greatest beauty, tied together with ropes, and daily exposed to sale. Nor were these men ashamed, oh! horrid wickedness, to give up their nearest relations; nay, their own children, to slavery." Wulfstan, knowing the obstinacy of these people, sometimes stayed two months among them, preaching every Lord's day; by which, in process of time, he made so great an impression upon their minds, that they abandoned that wicked trade, and set an example to all England to do the same. A Norman bishop, therefore, seems to have been the first to raise his voice against the burning shame of slave-dealing in England.

During this period there is no evidence that a single cargo of corn was exported from our fertile island. Horses, however, some portion of the time, formed a valuable article among the exports, but this trade was checked by Athelstan, who by one of his laws prohibited their being sent out of the kingdom, except such as were to be given as presents. Wool, also, was among the most valuable articles of export, which may account for the disproportionate price the fleece appears to have borne, compared with the sheep's carcase. The wool was chiefly purchased by the Flemings, who were at that time the great manufacturers for the woollen goods of Europe. Tin and lead still continued to be articles of export, as in the time of the Britons and Romans, and iron and the precious metals formed part of the produce exported. Articles of gold and silver were the chief manufactured goods exported by the Anglo-Saxons: a proof that there was no lack of gold and silver in the island.

The articles of import were more numerous than those of export. Among them may be enumerated books—especially for the use of the Church; and as books at that time were rare, they fetched high prices. Other articles imported for the Church were relics, images, pictures, vestments, veils, altar-cloths, and all the various utensils and ornaments then used in the church. This traffic was chiefly carried on by the clergy. Precious stones, silver, linen, spices, drugs and other kinds of goods, came from Venice first, and afterwards from the cities of Pisa and Amalphi; wines came from Spain and France; cloths from Germany and Flanders; and furs, deer-skins, oils, ropes, and other articles from Scandinavia.

Money and Coins.—Money and coins may to modern readers appear to have been one and the same thing. But it was not so at one period of the Anglo-Saxon rule. Frequent mention is made of "living money," which consisted of slaves and cattle, having a certain value set upon them by law, at which they passed current in the payment of debts and the purchase of goods. If, for instance, a person owed another a given sum of money, and had not a sufficient quantity of coin to pay, he had to supply the deficiency by giving a certain number of slaves, horses, cattle or sheep, at the rate put upon them by law, when they passed for money to make up that sum. In some parts of England, where coins were scarcer, almost all debts were paid and purchases made by "living money." It was as much the current coin as gold and silver, except in one instance, that the Church, either designing to discourage slavery, or what is more probable, wishing to get all the gold and silver it could obtain, refused to accept of slaves as payment for penance.

As regards the coin of this period it varied considerably. At first it was of course Roman money that was used. The Romans had carried much of this money with them; but much was left behind in the hands of the provincial Britons. It was probably as much their cash in hand that tempted the invasion of the Saxons as the fertility and beauty of the country. It was certainly one of the chief objects of their piratical expeditions; and when they had settled by invitation in the island, no sooner did they quarrel with the Britons than they seized their cash as well as their goods and estates. The current coin, therefore, at this time, was that on which was stamped the image of imperial Cæsar. But this money could not last for ever. When much of it had been spent in commerce, it became necessary to produce a new coinage. At what time the several Anglo-Saxon kings of the Heptarchy began to coin money is uncertain; but it would appear that this prerogative of royalty was exercised soon after the Saxon chiefs assumed the regal dignity. All the fines specified in the laws of Ethelbright, king of Kent, are estimated in shillings, which were Saxon denominations of money: a proof that shillings were the current coin of the kingdom of Kent in his reign, if not before. With the exception of Ethelbright's shilling, the oldest coin discovered is one of Edwin's, king of Northumberland, but probably there were many others struck by the early kings of the Heptarchy. Coins of a later date—as those of Ethelwulf, Ethelbert, of several kings of Wessex, Mercia, East Anglia, and Northumberland, and of Edgar and Ethelred—have been discovered in recent years, a rare collection of which are deposited among the treasures of the British Museum.

And now comes the question: what were the coins or denominations of money current among the Anglo-Saxons, and what was their relative value? This is a question that has puzzled antiquarians, and cannot be satisfactorily answered. Doubts and differences of opinion exist both as to the value or weight, and as to the relative value of nearly every one of them. The only thing absolutely certain seems to be that the pound was always understood to be a full pound of silver. This, however, does not appear to have been the common troy pound, but a measure long known in Germany as the Cologne pound which was three-quarters of an ounce less than the pound troy: that is, it was only eleven ounces and a quarter, troy-weight, or 5,400 grains. This was evidently the money pound of the Anglo-Saxons, and out of every such pound of silver, were coined 240 silver pennies, each weighing 22½ grains, making twenty pennies out of every ounce. The next denomination of money among the Anglo-Saxons is the mark, which appears to have been introduced by the Danes when they obtained a settlement in England by the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum. That the mark had its origin in Scandinavia, and was brought from thence into England and France, is clear. It is first mentioned in the articles of agreement between King Alfred and Guthrum the Danish chief, which is full proof of its Scandinavian origin. The weight and value of the mark is not clearly ascertained, but the most probable conjecture is, that it weighed 3,600 grains troy, of gold or silver, and was equal, in weight of the latter, to 1*l.* 17*s.* 9*d.* of our present money, and exactly two-thirds of 2*l.* 16*s.* 3*d.* the weight in silver of the Saxon pound. The mancus is another species of money mentioned in the laws and chronicles of the Anglo-Saxons. It is a matter of dispute whether the mancus was a real coin or only, like the pound and the mark, a denomination. It seems probable, however, that the mancus was a real gold coin, and that this coin was struck by several of the Anglo-Saxon kings, as well as by contemporary sovereigns. According to Archbishop Ælfric, the mancus was worth thirty Saxon pennies: the weight of it, therefore, must have been 675 troy grains, which was the actual weight of gold coins current in the middle ages, both in Europe, Asia and Africa, though under different names. A coin of the same value and weight must have been a great convenience to merchants, and it seems to point out the fact that it was a medium of commercial intercourse between the various nations with whom it passed current. Its value was 7 shillings and a fraction of our present money. The next species of money mentioned, is the ora, but whether that was a real coin or only a denomination is uncertain. Like the mark, it was introduced by the Danes, and it appears to have been the eighth part of the mark in weight. Its weight, therefore, was 450 troy grains, equal to 4*s.* 8½*d.* of present money. And now comes the Saxon shilling. There is no coin mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon laws and chronicles more frequently than this. It was in shillings that penalties were estimated; that the price of life and limb, and payments and prices of commodities were fixed. But, notwithstanding, antiquaries and historians long considered that the Saxon shilling was a denomination and not a coin. Many at the present day hold this opinion, although there is the plain testimony of several Anglo-Saxon writers that the shilling was a coin. Archbishop Ælfric distinctly states that the English have only three names for their coins—mancuses, shillings, and pennies. The doubt seems to have arisen from the circumstance that no Anglo-Saxon shillings have been discovered, which is no reason that the coin should not have been issued

from the mint. Of the exact weight and value of the shilling there is no doubt. As 48 were coined out of the pound or 5,400 grains troy, each of them must have weighed 112½ grains, equal to 1*s.* 2*d.* of our money. Another species of money mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon laws is the thrisma: money which has also greatly perplexed antiquarians. Some make it of the value of three Saxon shillings, others equal only to a Saxon penny, while others confess their utter ignorance of its value. The fact appears to be that the thrisma was never universally circulated; that it was coined only for a short time, and then laid aside as unnecessary. Its weight, according to the most probable conjecture, was 67½ troy grains—equal to 3 Saxon pennies, and to 8½*d.* of present money. The Saxon penny was the most common coin struck by the Anglo-Saxon monarchs. It is mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon laws under the names of pending, penning, penniga, or penny. The weight and value of this coin was the same throughout the whole of this period. As before mentioned, it was of silver, and as 240 were coined out of the Saxon pound, its weight was 22½ grains, and was therefore equal in weight and value to our present three-penny pieces. But though the Saxon silver penny was small and insignificant it was at that date a coin of no mean value. It would have purchased as much provisions or goods of any kind as five shillings would at the present day. Nay, more: in the days of King Athelstan four Saxon pennies would have purchased, according to law, one of the best sheep in England, and thirty would have purchased a good fat ox. Supposing sheep and oxen to have been of the same quality as those fed by our graziers, that must have been a low price indeed for it would now be troublesome to count the silver three-penny pieces it would take to pay for either the one or the other. Other coins of the Anglo-Saxons, were the triens, 15 grains troy, of the value of 2*d.*; the halflings, or halfpennies, 11¼ grains troy, of the value of one penny farthing; the feorthlings, or farthings, about 5½ grains troy; and the styca, a copper coin which was in value about one-eighth of a farthing.

SILVER COINS OF ALFRED.

All the Saxon coins were of rude workmanship: a circumstance from which it has been argued that the art of coining was derived from Germany and not acquired by imitation of the Roman models. Besides the coins struck by the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, the archbishops of Canterbury and York appear to have been privileged to have mints of their own. Several foreign coins, also, appear to have been in circulation, among which may be mentioned gold byzantines, or byzants, each weighing 73 grains troy, and being of the value of 40 Saxon pennies, or 9*s.* 4½*d.* of our present money. There appears, also, to have been silver byzantines, which according to Camden were of the same value as the florin of Queen Victoria. The byzantines were coined at Constantinople or Byzantium, whence they derived their name, and few coins ever had a longer or more universal currency; they having been coined from the very commencement to the close of the Eastern Empire, not only in all its provinces, but in those countries, as Britain, which had been under the rule of the Western Empire. They passed current in the days of Dunstan; for it is recorded that he purchased the estate of Hindon, or Hendon, in Middlesex for 200 gold byzantines, of King Edgar; an estate he afterwards presented or bequeathed to the monks of St. Peter at Westminster. Other foreign coins, in circulation during this period in England, were the ancient Frank solidus, which was the same in weight and value as the Saxon mancus; and the lesser Frank solidus which was equal in value to 12 Saxon pennies, or 2*s.* 10*d.* of our present money. It was from the use of the lesser Frank solidus, that the present division of our money pound into 20 shillings, each shilling containing 12 pence was introduced.

As no coins either of Scotland or Wales have been discovered, it has been doubted whether any metallic money was coined in those countries. That doubt is untenable. As regards Scotland, when it is considered that the Picts and Scots were near neighbours to the Saxons, and that about the middle of the tenth century its kings ruled over the Saxon population between the Forth and the Tweed, it is not probable that they were ignorant of the use of money and the art of coining it. At all events, if they did not mint money themselves, from the constant intercourse which the Scots had with the Saxons, they must have been familiar with its use. It is still more improbable that the Britons were ignorant of the use and art of coining money. Their ancestors had been well acquainted with both from the earliest times, and more particularly when under the Roman domination, and they could not therefore have been ignorant of its value as a medium of trade. That the kings of Wales did coin money is proved to demonstration by their laws; for they mention the coining of money as one of the four unalienable prerogatives belonging to them. Then again the kings of England are recorded to have imposed a certain tribute on the kings of Wales, part of which was paid in money; and the salaries of the great officers in their courts were paid, and the prices of all commodities were rated in money. In a word, the Leges Wallicæ distinctly mentions both gold and silver coins as existing in Wales at this period, so that there can be no doubt that the princes of Wales had a coinage of their own. There is no reason, however, to believe that coined money was plentiful either in Scotland or Wales; as in truth it was not among their richer neighbours the Anglo-Saxons. It was from the scarcity of money in England that the prices of commodities were so low, particularly of such as were plentiful; as land, for instance, an acre of which, even of the richest quality, was not worth more than sixteen Saxon pennies, or about four shillings of our present money.

CHAPTER VI.

The Manners and Customs of the Anglo-Saxons, from A.D. 449 to A.D. 1066.

THE manners and customs of the Anglo-Saxons present an interesting field for research. Much of the present habits and principles of English society have been derived therefrom, and it is important, therefore, in a national history to unfold somewhat of the inner life of those whose blood still flows in our veins, and whom we resemble not only in person but in many remarkable peculiarities. For example, the respect now paid to females and the influence which they enjoy in society is but a copy of the condition of the Anglo-Saxon females Instead of being slaves, as they were in some countries, they exercised a permanent influence over men, and associated with them as their equals. It was rare that a Saxon female took part in the labours of the field; their duties were in their homes, as mothers and housewives. They could even possess land, slaves, and other property, and they could make wills and bequeath possessions; all of which prove that they were not degraded, helpless beings, as in the Eastern countries, but took a fair share in all the duties of life. Other analogies might be pointed out equally remarkable; but the present chapter will be chiefly devoted to a description of the dwellings of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, together with their costume, their domestic and social usage, their popular pastimes, their superstitions, their food, and their mode of living in general. There is no work bequeathed to us by our Anglo-Saxon ancestors professing to describe all these; but much may be gathered respecting them from their chronicles, laws, works of science and learning, homilies, almanacks, wills, grants, leases, charters, and especially from the great national art of illumination. Much light is also thrown upon them by antiquarian research, which has in late ages been diligent in exploring the barrows in which the early Saxons were interred in various parts of the island.

Houses and Furniture.—Although the houses of the Anglo Saxons in a great measure resembled the old cottages and farmhouses common in modern England, being framed of timber and having walls covered with plaster and clay, yet the houses of the rich and noble appear to have been, at least toward the middle of this period, well and sometimes splendidly furnished. The skill of the embroiderer was called in to hide the rude workmanship of the carpenter. Hangings of needlework and painted cloth, and of silk richly embroidered with gold and colours, adorned their walls in rich profusion. And as it was with their houses so it was with their furniture. That was of rude construction, but it was highly ornamented with embroidery. Footstools are mentioned as being covered with woven lions, and representations of flowers; and chairs or benches with the most costly embroidery. Saxon illuminations represent the chairs of the period under two forms; one having a seat held in tension by one or more cross bars, and the other a high, straight back. Most of them appear to have been ornamented with representations of beasts and birds at their extremities. Their tables were frequently of the most costly description, and from the illuminations we gather that they were covered with cloths, and were furnished with knives, spoons, drinking-vessels, bowls, and dishes, but the fork is not represented. Some of these vessels, especially the drinking-horns, were of the most costly description. A high value was set upon some of the drinking-horns of this period. Witlaf, king of Mercia gave the drinking-horn of his table to Croyland monastery, "that the elder monks might drink therefrom on festivals, and in their benedictions remember the soul of the donor." Towards the Norman conquest glass vessels were used, but they appear to have been of French manufacture. By the middle and lower ranks cups of horn and wood were commonly used. Among other articles of furniture mentioned are silver candelabra and candlesticks, silver mirrors, horn lanterns, and hand-bells; but all these belong to the latter end of the period. Anglo-Saxon illuminations depict bedsteads having posts and curtains; but more generally the Saxons slept in a species of box or trough filled with straw, some having clothes or coverlids over them, skins of animals being sometimes used for that purpose. Pillows of straw, bed-clothes and sheets are also mentioned, but these probably came into use towards the close of the period. Warriors slept in the halls in which they feasted, the tables being removed and the floor spread with beds and bolsters. Their arms were placed above their heads, ready to be grasped if occasion required, which indicates that it was only in times of war that they so reposed. At such times the coverlid was the warrior's cloak, which was too short to form a complete covering.

Costume.—In the earliest period the Anglo-Saxons paid little attention to dress. Their dress for some time was only that of the warrior; scale armour and the square helmet. Yet that they were then fond of some display is clear from the pages of the Welsh bard Aneurin, who wrote in the sixth century, for he says that their armour was sometimes gilded, and that they wore a profusion of hair, of which they were as vain as women would be, wreathing it with beads and ornaments; their necks being encircled with gold torques. That they were fond of ornament is also proved by barrows opened at Beach Downs, in the neighbourhood of Canterbury, and on the south coast of Kent, in which the bones of some of these early Saxon warriors were deposited. Mingled with spear-heads, knives, and iron bosses of shields, beads of various colours, and earrings of simple structure have been

discovered; and in some of the later tumuli of a most beautiful character, buckles and ornaments, pendent necklaces of garnets set in ike modern earrings, and other ornaments have rought to light. The period to which these arrows belong is ascribed to that between the 582 when Augustine arrived in England, and 2, when cemeteries were formed near churches, thin the walls of towns.

dress in which the Saxons appeared in our appears to have been worn for a considerable

In the year 785 a law was enacted prohibitdy painting—for the Saxons, like the Britons, l their bodies—and from the same law it is ined that pagan modes of dress were still d. After this period, however, a great change ace in costume. Then it was that our ancestors ger put on garments in the manner of pagans; nts which were loose and flowing, and chiefly f linen adorned with broad borders, woven and dered with various colours. Such garments neither appear decent nor graceful; but some of st opulent appear to have worn under their s a kind of tunic fitted to the shape of their which were ornamented with patches of skins nals of various colours. The dress of the women milar to that of the men, but it was more in- as their tunics left their bosoms bare. As tion advanced, however, this pagan dress was aside, and that of a Christian adopted. Inhe history of British costume commences with tons from the eighth to the tenth century, for at that period they began to pay particular on to the modes of dress; modes which disbed one class from another far more distinctly e costume of the present day.

SAXON FEMALE COSTUME.

ording to an illuminated Benedictional, executed n the years 963 and 984, the royal costume consisted of a crown of simple form; a plain tunic reaching nearly to the knees, and conound the waist by a linen girdle; a short blue bordered with gold which covered the left arm, g the right free, it being fastened upon that er by a gold fibula or brooch; and a kind of ged stocking: that is, the legs were enswathed the knee in garters of gold, tied in a knot at

the top, from which hung golden tassels. The ordinary costume of a nobleman or chief differed in no degree from that of the king, except that they wore no regal diadem. In like manner the costume of a queen and the noble and wealthy ladies of the land was nearly the same in every particular. It was a long gown falling in folds round the feet and having wide hanging sleeves; and a capacious blue mantle, almost enveloping the body, which was wound round the waist and thrown over the left shoulder, from whence it descended behind the back, nearly reaching to the ground, and was so disposed as to cover the left side of the body from the waist downward, leaving the right side partially free; the mantle hanging from the left arm in graceful folds. The general civil male costume of the Anglo-Saxons was a plain tunic, which enveloped the body, reaching to the knee, and fastened round the waist by a girdle of folded cloth, or secured by an ornamental band; and a short cloak which was generally fastened by a brooch upon the right shoulder: sometimes a larger cloak was worn, similar to the mantle of the queen as above described. The general dress of the ladies was equally simple. It consisted of a long gown falling in folds over the feet; a supertunic reaching to the knee, worn over the gown; a wide mantle covering the upper portion of the body; and a coverchief or hood, which covered the head and hung over the shoulders, giving the wearer

SAXON MALE COSTUME.

a nun-like appearance. The prevailing colours, both of the dress of males and females, were blue, red and green, with sometimes pink and violet, and occasionally white. The ecclesiastical costume of the period was of course derived from Rome. That of the hierarchy was the chasuble, a purple mantle bordered with gold, which covered the upper parts of the body, reaching beyond the waist and as far as the wrist when the arms were allowed to hang beside the body; a pall or narrow strip of woollen cloth, upon which crosses were embroidered; and a yellow dalmatica which was worn under the chasuble, having long sleeves reaching nearly to the wrist, beneath which appeared the end of the stole, a band or scarf passed

over the shoulders and round the neck; the undermost part of the dress was the alb of blue with tight sleeves to the wrist. No mitres were worn at that period, but the pastoral crook was indispensable, having reference to the Saviour as "the good shepherd." Every portion of the priestly costume had an allegorical allusion either to the Christian faith or the office of the priesthood. Thus the chasuble represented the purple garment with which the Saviour was adorned in mockery in his hours of agony, and the stole the cords with which he was bound; while the girdle was the symbol of continency. As regards the military costume, it differed but little from the civil, many warriors being represented with a shield, spear, axe, or bows and arrows, without any addition to the ordinary civil costume. Some warriors, however, in the tenth century evidently wore some description of metal armour, for in an Anglo-Saxon poem of that period this passage occurs:—

"Their battle mail shone
By hard hands well locked.
The shining iron rings
Sung against their weapons
When they to the palace
In their formidable apparel were delighted to go."

This mailed garment, which was a tunic, appears to have been formed of linked rings or scales of plate riveted one to another, and to have been similar to the hauberk of single chain-mail of the Plantagenet period.

RINGED MAIL ARMOUR.

Shoes were worn by all classes of the Anglo-Saxons, for though the peasantry are often depicted in the illuminations barelegged they are rarely barefooted. Their shoes are sometimes painted black, and appear to have had an opening down the instep which was secured by two thongs. The soles of shoes worn by all classes were of wood, and the upper part of leather; and they were so fitted to the feet that the order of the toes was discernible, the great toe terminating in a point. At one time a sort of short boot or buskin was worn, and a sock is sometimes seen in the illuminations, worn over the hose instead of bandages.

The costume of the Danes greatly resembled that of the Anglo-Saxons, so that it does not require description. Both Saxon and Dane paid great attention to dressing the hair. Fine hair was considered one of the greatest beauties and ornaments of their persons. The laity wore it long and flowing, being parted on the forehead, and suffered to fall naturally down their shoulders. The beard, also, was for a long time ample, and generally forked; but at a later period it was shaved off, except on the upper lip. The clergy, both secular and regular, had the crowns of their heads shaved, their hair cut short, and their beards shaved close in obedience to the laws, and in imitation of the practice of all the Western Churches. This tonsure of the clergy was considered as an act of mortification and self-denial to which many submitted with reluctance. Some of them, however, preached bitterly against the wearing of long hair by the laity, declaring it to be highly criminal; but though it seems to have had an effect for some time, inasmuch as the illuminations exhibit some figures with the hair cropped and the face shaven, the old Teutonic passion for long flowing hair was never eradicated. Females were allowed to wear long hair, without being interfered with by the clergy; on the contrary, the hair was considered by them to be their natural ornament.

Domestic and Social Usages.—The social disposition of the Anglo-Saxons may be termed convivial. Fraternities of various kinds abounded, and their bonds of friendship were cemented by frequent convivial meetings. By their laws, every freeman who was the head of a family was compelled to be a member of the decennary or neighbourship in which he dwelt, all the members of which were pledges for each other's good behaviour to the public. This created a connection between them, and gave them an interest in each other's welfare; and their ties of union were strengthened by eating and drinking at the common table of the neighbourship. But besides these legal societies there were others of a voluntary character, some of which were composed of the clergy, others of the laity, and others of both clergy and laity. One great object of these fraternities, like many of those at the present day, was to promote good-fellowship by the means of frequent festive meetings. This is evident from the fact that forfeitures were generally paid in honey and malt, which were to be converted into mead for the conviviality of the fraternity.

Good cheer was a thing by no means despised by our Saxon ancestors. The country supplied them with an abundance for their tables, and, like their descendants, they were not averse to feasting. As flesh meat was cheap, it constituted a large portion of the diet of all classes. The very peasants appear to have enjoyed animal food to a great extent, for by a law of Wightræd it was declared that whoever gave his servant flesh on fast-days should be punished by the pillory, and if a servant ate it of his own accord he was either to be fined or to suffer "in his hide." On fast-days the food consisted of milk, cheese, and eggs, but fasting does not appear to have been much relished even by some of the monks. An Anglo-Saxon missionary, in the eighth century, declared that those priests who rejected animal food were ungrateful to

for his bounties. But although some of the
s may have abstained from flesh, they had plenty
, the art of catching which is said to have
first taught by Wilfrid, bishop of York, to the
ing people of the kingdom of Sussex, about A.D.
In some parts of Wessex rents of farms con-
s to rivers were paid in fish, of which there was
ndance. William of Malmesbury says that not
he nobles of this period were addicted to the
f gluttony, but also that the monks themselves
ot averse to the flesh-pots of Egypt, both before
for the Norman monarchs. In his Chronicle he
ks that the Saxon monarchs commanded four
banquets to be served up daily to all their
ers, choosing rather to have much superfluity at
tables rather than the least appearance of de-
y; but in his day, he complains, that it had
e the custom of the Norman court to have only
ily entertainment, out of pretended politeness,
reality out of parsimony. The days of good
therefore, had then passed away, and the
n proved himself to be less hospitable than the

.

modes of preparing food among the Anglo-
s were by boiling, baking, and broiling; the
r being the most common, as during one-half of
ar animal food was consumed in a salted state.
food was seasoned with various kinds of herbs,
rt being their chief vegetable ingredient. Bread
l an article of universal consumption. A Saxon
is described as saying, "Without my craft
table would be empty, and without bread meat
become nauseous. I strengthen the heart of
nd little ones cannot do without me." Bread,
ll as fish and soup, or bouilli, are represented in
luminations of the period. At their entertain-
both sexes assembled round the table, as well
family gatherings. Their manners at table
what would now be considered rude and coarse.
neat was handed round on spits, and every one
on the joints what portion he pleased, and after
t the bones and other remains were scattered on
or. In the earliest times the Saxons ate their
half-raw, but at a later period it was well
l. One of the canons of the Church, indeed,
d a penance of three days' fast for eating half-
l meat unwittingly, and four days, if it was
sumed knowingly. Both males and females
relished the pleasures of the table. Malmes-
says that the former of all ranks were also
ed to the vice of excessive drinking, frequently
ing whole days and nights in the indulgence
ut intermission. Even in their religious festivals
lrank copious draughts of liquor to the honour
rist and their numerous saints. Drunkenness
ot appear to have been forbidden by the canons,
; one particular stage of it, *i.e.*, dead drunken-
"This," says one of the canons, "is drunkenness
the state of the mind is changed, the tongue
ers, the eyes are disturbed, the head is giddy,
lly swelled, and pain follows." The liquors used
Anglo-Saxons were wine, mead, ale, pigment,
, and cyder; but wine was only drunk at the
of kings and nobles, as it was then an ex-
e foreign luxury. The guests drank from the same cup or horn—ox horns—some of which were two feet in length and one in circumference, so that they might regale themselves with a good draught if they chose. And that they did choose is evident. Edmund I. was murdered at the festival of St. Augustine, A.D. 946, in a drunken brawl; and it may be concluded that Dunstan, when he dragged the fair Edwy from the inner chamber of his palace by the hair of his head back to the banquet-hall, had taken too deep a draught from the common horn. To drink deeply was an old custom of the Saxons. Before their conversion to Christianity they believed that imbibing large draughts of ale was one of the chief felicities of their heroes when admitted into the hall of their god Wodin; and after their conversion to Christianity they made no scruple in imbibing such draughts. So deeply indeed did some of them drink that disputes often arose as to the quantity which each person had drank, to remedy which Edgar caused drinking-horns to be marked, so that no one might take more at a draught than from one mark or knob to another.

Hospitality was a leading virtue among the Anglo-Saxons. It was the virtue of their German ancestors. Tacitus says that there was no nation more liberal than the ancient Germans; that they received all comers into their houses, and entertained them as long as their provisions held out, and that when they were consumed they conducted their guests to the next house, where they were treated with the same generosity. At a later date, the natural disposition of the Saxons to hospitality was encouraged and strengthened by religious motives. It was rendered imperative on the clergy by the canons of the Church both to practise hospitality themselves, and to be constant in recommending it to their people. Hence the palace, the mansion, and the monastery opened wide their doors to travellers and strangers, the latter especially affording them both lodging and entertainment.

Among the national virtues of the Anglo-Saxons those of chastity in youth and conjugal fidelity were remarkable. These, also, were the characteristics of their race. It may be questioned whether they were not more virtuous in their pagan state than they were after their conversion to Christianity, especially when the imprudent zeal of the Benedictine monks attempted to carry the virtue of chastity to a greater height than the laws of nature or the good of society would allow. Still, even then, it was some time before a change in this particular became fully manifest; but that it was manifested there is direct evidence from the pens of historians and divines of the later period of the Anglo-Saxon rule: for it is to the decline of virtue, and to the many unnatural vices to which the prohibition of a married clergy had given birth, that the ruin of the Saxon dominion is chiefly ascribed by those writers.

But though the Anglo-Saxons were noted for conjugal fidelity, their love was not always extended to their offspring. They are said to have been remarkable for the warmth of their affections to their family and relations, and yet it is on record that, at the earlier period of their settlement in England, child desertion was common, and that after their conversion the practice was not wholly unknown. At the latter

period, however, it was a crime, and a law was passed for its repression. But this law was, from its humanity, ill calculated to effect the object for which it was enacted; for by it if any one found and fostered a deserted child he was to be paid six shillings for its maintenance and care for the first year, twelve for the next, and thirty for the third; after which the foster parent was to receive a sum varying according to the appearance which the child exhibited of having been well treated. Generally mothers nursed their own children; but Anglo-Saxon ladies of rank, even in the former part of the period, delivered their children to be nursed by other women: a practice which Pope Gregory denounced in a letter to Augustine as a wicked custom. Instances are on record of much gratitude shown to those by whom children had been thus nursed and nurtured; as in the case of Edgar, who gave lands to the wife of an ealdorman to whose care he had been intrusted from his infancy.

Women were considered adults among the Anglo-Saxons at twelve, and men at fifteen years of age. Children were baptized by immersion within thirty days after their birth; but holy oil was also used, as in the present ceremonies of the Romish church. As in our age, there were sponsors; and those who undertook the responsibility were not only considered to become connected with their godchild but with their fellow-sponsors. The names given to children in baptism indicated qualities which it was hoped, and perhaps supposed that they would exhibit in after life; some of which were expressive of the gentler, but more generally the rougher, qualities of human nature. Of the former may be mentioned, as an example, Edgiva, a female name signifying "the happy gift," and of the latter Athelwulf, or "the noble wolf." Surnames or family names were not in use till after the reign of Edward the Confessor, and as several persons living near each other sometimes had the same proper name it was customary to add some word to his name descriptive of his person, as "the long," or "the black," etc.; but such names did not descend to their posterity nor become the surnames of their families. Occasionally, indeed, these secondary names became gradually stationary, or began to descend hereditarily as family denominations, but surnames were not common till after the Norman conquest.

Mention has already been made of the respect paid to females by the Anglo-Saxons. Those of the lower class were treated with great consideration; and as for the Anglo-Saxon ladies they were admitted into their most august assemblies, and great attention was paid to their advice and counsels. Laws were made to secure their rights, protect their persons, and defend their honour from insults; and they were courted with considerable gallantry by their admirers. In their marriages their inclination as well as their dignity was consulted, and great care was taken that a proper provision was made for them. Thus, by one of the laws of Ethelbert, if a wife who had borne children was left a widow, she was entitled to half her deceased husband's property. But due care was taken for a wife's maintenance before marriage, apart from any legal enactment of the period. Thus an expectant bridegroom having gained the consent of the lady and her friends he was not only himself obliged to give a pledge that he would keep his wife in circumstances suitable to her condition, but his friends were called upon to become sureties for the due fulfilment of his engagements. Nor was this all, for the friends of the bridegroom had to become responsible for the due support of the offspring of the marriage. All this being done, the next step was to fix the amount of the morgen, or morning gift—the pin-money of the present day—and of the property to be settled upon her in case of her being left a widow. The contract was finally settled by a mutual pledge to this effect, that if they removed from one jurisdiction to another no injury should arise to the wife, and that if she committed any offence proper compensation should be given to the husband. No marriage could be lawfully celebrated without the presence of the bride's guardian, who solemnized the marriage by delivering her to the bridegroom with these words:—"I give thee my daughter—sister or relation—to be thy honour and thy wife, to keep thy keys and to share with thee in thy bed and goods. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." After this the priest implored a blessing on the union. The ties of marriage were esteemed sacred and inviolable. It was an engagement which nothing could break except the infidelity of the wife or the death of one of the parties. At the same time it would appear that among the nobles there were occasionally voluntary separations; and especially after the doctrine of the merit of the vows of chastity had been promulgated and lauded by the Benedictine order. Then, if a husband or a wife made a vow of chastity, the separation was inevitable, and those whom they had thus, under the cloak of religion, repudiated could not marry again. Although dead to each other, yet in the eyes of canon law they were still man and wife.

The influence which Anglo-Saxon females had in society was very marked, and often led to most important results. Previous pages show that they were the chief instruments of introducing Christianity. If it had not been for Ethelbert's Christian queen it is probable that Augustine might have preached in vain to her pagan husband. Politically, also, queens took a leading part in the affairs of the nation, and though their position was lowered for a time, through the crimes of Eadburgha, queen of Beorthric, king of Wessex, yet long before the close of the period it was recovered. As examples of the influence of women of the higher classes in domestic society for good, we need only to refer the reader to what has been previously recorded of Osburgha the mother of the great King Alfred; and of Ethelfreda, Alfred's eldest daughter, who is designated by the old chroniclers as the wisest lady then in England. At a later date the importance and distinction of the queens of this period is strongly marked by the union of their offspring with foreign princes and monarchs, which had the happiest effect in promoting peace and intercourse between England and the states of the Continent. In every station of life, in truth, the Anglo-Saxon women enjoyed a position analogous to those of the present age; although of course that position is greatly improved through the advances made in education and civilization.

Travelling.—The usual method of travelling among

lo-Saxons was on horseback. The nobles had
s retinues of horsemen. Canute is said to
peared in public with three thousand men all
unted and armed. The trappings of their
were often very splendid. Wheel carriages
ncommon but not unknown. Chariots are
ed in books and delineated in illuminations.
ere light two-wheeled cars, and also four-
l vehicles, the latter of which carried four or
x persons in a sort of hammock. B"+ these

SAXON VEHICLE.

s were of a rude construction, and were ill
l for comfort in travelling; nor did the roads
period afford facilities for easy transit from
place.

ements.—The amusements of the Anglo-Saxons
at different periods. In pagan times they were
a brutal character. These were what may be
warlike amusements; and they consisted of
g, swimming, leaping, riding, wrestling, and
g. One of their favourite diversions was the
dance; in which young men tripped the
fantastic toe" among the points of swords and
or the entertainment of the spectators. Like
ncestors, they imagined that martial exercises
uted the chief amusement and felicity of the
in Valhalla, the abode of future happiness.
creed therefore was warlike; and it is no
that warlike amusements were their delight.
Gangler asked how the heroes diverted them-
when not engaged in drinking ale from the
of their enemies, Har replied, that they armed
lves and fought till they cut one another in
ntil the hour of repast approached, when they
ted their horses all safe and sound and re-
to drink in the palace of Wodin! It appears
been from the martial exercises of the Anglo-
that the tournaments of the middle ages
their origin. In the meantime, they them-
aid aside their bloody combats and disgraceful
ions, at least to a great extent, for more inno-
orts and pastimes. In the days of Alfred
g was a favourite sport of the nobles. Indeed,
the Anglo-Saxon kings and nobles were great
of the chase, and the woods and forests of that
afforded them abundant game for their plea-
The principal objects of pursuit were boars,
nd wild deer, but hares and sometimes goats
unted. Hawking ranked next in consideration
ting. It would appear that kings and nobles
desired to retain this sport for themselves; for monks, who at one time had a passion for it, were forbidden to keep hawks and falcons. Hounds and hawks were highly valued, for they were often sent as presents to the Saxon monarchs, and were frequently bequeathed by will. By the laws of one part of the island, the price of a hawk or a greyhound was equal to that of a man, and the robbing of a hawk's nest as great a crime, and was punished with equal severity, as the murder of a Christian. The dog and the hawk were the constant companions of the nobles; and numerous laws were enacted for their protection. But notwithstanding their passion for hunting, the game-laws of this period were mild compared with those of modern times, and were even more liberal than those of the present day. No one was allowed to interfere with the king when, at the sound of the horn, he pursued the chase; but at all other times every man might pursue animals on the lands which he cultivated. Among the lower class there were field sports of a humbler character; birds being taken in snares, traps, and with bird-lime, while wild ducks were taken by decoys. Fishing was another out-door amusement; the rivers affording a plentiful supply of all kinds of fish on which the angler might try his skill. Eels were taken in large numbers in the marsh lands of the eastern counties, and salmon in the Dee. Of indoor amusements there were plenty for every one, from the king to the peasant. There were games of chess and backgammon, or games somewhat similar, in both which the monks appear to have indulged to excess; whence in the reign of Edgar they were prohibited from engaging in games of chance. Kings and nobles, however, keenly indulged in these games. It is said that when bishop Aetheric obtained admission to Canute about midnight, he found him and his courtiers engaged at play; some at dice and others at chess. In their festivals gleemen, like showmen of the present day, were important characters; some of whom were mimics, dancers, tumblers, and jugglers; while others were harpers and ballad-singers. Athletic exercises throughout the period were common, and were not only practised by youths and professionals, but by the clergy; for according to Bede, St. Cuthbert excelled in them.

Superstition.—Throughout the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period the population was greatly given to superstition. On their first coming into England the Saxons brought with them a deep-rooted belief in witches, charms, and prognostics, and the light of Christianity was not sufficiently potent to chase that dark belief from their minds. Fortune-tellers and diviners were courted, caressed, and rewarded by all classes of society: wrinkled old women especially, who practised these arts, were held in the highest veneration. Omens were drawn from the most trivial circumstances, and dreams operated upon the mind as though they were real events. After their conversion to Christianity, the Saxon kings promulgated laws to repress the old national superstitions and the veneration for fortune-tellers, and the clergy were commanded by the canons to be diligent in preaching against diviners, sorcerers, auguries, charms, incantations, and "all the filth of the wicked, and dotages of the Gentiles;" but all this failed to uproot the

national superstitions. Indeed the Church itself in a great measure rendered these attempts to repress them nugatory, for that also administered to the credulity of the age. The miracles promulgated by the monks were as ridiculous, if not as mischievous, as the tales told by the dealers with the powers of darkness; for many of them were of the most pernicious character, as were also their stories of visions, ghosts, revelations, and enchantments, all of which the Saxon population were more ready to believe than the sublimer truths of Holy Writ.

Sepulture.—The rites of sepulture among the Anglo-Saxons demand brief notice. In the earlier period, like the Britons, they buried in barrows: that is, they laid the corpse on the surface of the ground and covered them with stones and earth; the mound covering the body being sometimes only a few inches or a couple of feet from the ground, while, at other times, they were of a gigantic structure. Several of these barrows have been opened in the county of Kent, as well as in Derbyshire and other parts of the country. The mode of laying the corpse on the ground and covering it over with earth or stones, was even practised when the Saxons, after their conversion, were buried in churches; for it is recorded that the floors of some churches were so encumbered with little mounds that they became unfit for the celebration of divine service. Hence it was that several canons were made prohibiting the burial of any deceased persons in churches except priests and saints, and such as were well able to pay for that privilege; and even these were to be deposited in graves under the pavement. At first, when the practice of interment in pits or graves became general, coffins were not common; but subsequently the rich were buried in stone, and the lower classes in wooden coffins. Shrouds were used for lay corpses, but the clergy were buried in their canonicals. The house in which a corpse lay before interment was a scene of merry-making: there was feasting and dancing, as on the occasion of a wedding. This custom was discouraged by the clergy, but it was too agreeable to be soon abandoned, and it survived in some degree to the latest period. The mode of conducting a funeral among the Anglo-Saxons may receive illustration from that of the famous Archbishop Wilfrid, as thus described by his biographer Eddius:—"Upon a certain day many abbots and clergy met those who conducted the corpse of the holy bishop in a hearse, and earnestly begged that they might be allowed to wash the sacred body and dress it honourably, according to its dignity, and they obtained permission. Then one of the abbots named Bacula, spreading his surplice on the ground, the brethren deposited the holy body upon it, washed it with their own hands, dressed it in the pontifical habits, and then, taking it up, carried it towards the appointed place, singing psalms and hymns in the fear of God. Having advanced a little, they again deposited the corpse, pitched a tent over it, bathed the sacred body in pure water, dressed it in robes of fine linen, placed it in the hearse, and proceeded, singing psalms, towards the monastery of Ripon. When they approached the monastery, the whole family came out to meet them, bearing the holy relics. Of all this numerous company there was hardly one who abstained from tears; and all raising their voices, and joining in singing hymns and songs, they conducted the body into the church which the holy bishop had built and dedicated to St. Peter, and there deposited it in the most solemn and honourable manner." It may be mentioned that the custom of tolling the passing-bell originated in this period; and that at a death a payment called the "soul scat" was made to the clergy to pray for the soul of the departed. Before death, it was a custom among the rich to bequeath something to the Church, or, as it was termed, "a share of their estates to their own souls," to secure its repose. Thus, according to Asser, king Ethelwulf divided his estate "between his soul and his children;" and there were but few who had any hopes of heaven or fears of hell, who did not leave a share of their wealth to some church or monastery. This was one of the chief sources from whence the great wealth of the Church was derived; for at the close of this period the clergy possessed more than one-third of the land of England, besides the tithes on the whole, as well as money, plate, and moveables of all kinds in rich abundance. But the treasures heaped up by the Saxon clergy made to themselves wings and fled away; in other words, after the Conquest the greater portion fell into the hands of the Norman knights and barons, and the Norman priesthood.



SAXON WHEEL-PLOUGH.

NORMAN PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

The Civil and Military History of the Norman Period, from the Landing of William I., A.D. 1066, to the Death of King John, A.D. 1216.

SECTION I.

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

y displayed by the Normans after their vic- Hastings was unbounded. They vaulted their over the dead bodies of the Anglo-Saxons, lay thickly over the bloody field, and feasted de merry in the midst of the carnage. William was so elated by his triumph that he vowed a splendid abbey on the scene of his victory: which was in course of time accomplished. lls of the abbey which he erected embraced the f the hill on which Harold and his bravest rs were slain; and the high altar of the abbey is said to have stood where the standard of the Horse had been planted. It was called the of Battle, and it was endowed not only with rounding country, but with the property of the leaders who had perished in the conflict. from the convent of Marmontier, near Tours, their residence therein, and its abbot was y William independent of the Archbishop of ury.

before William's vow was performed he had pposition to encounter. The conquest of Eng- s not effected by this one blow. The victory n great, but it was not decisive. It was but mencement of a struggle in reality, which was d over a series of years and maintained by the with obstinate determination. The Saxon brave a warrior as the Norman: and though feat was the result of the conflict, it was chiefly e want of a leader of elevated character and ding authority among the resisting people to d and direct their strength. Harold's bravest had perished with him: his sons were too o assume authority; and Edgar Atheling, the n of Edward Ironside, the rightful heir to the was young, weak, and incompetent. Harold's -in-law, Morcar and Edwin, the powerful Earls humberland and Mercia, might, if they had triotic lovers of their country, have stood in ch; but they were ambitious of regal dignity, en they found that the Witan gave the pre- to Edgar Atheling, and that a part of the or their own self-interest, supported William, the military command was intrusted to ey exhibited no zeal for their country's cause. as proclaimed king by the Saxon Witan, but warriors were wanted, able and willing, to support him on the throne to which he was thus exalted.

While the Witan was deliberating and endeavouring to provide for the future, William was acting. He was a cautious general. The Londoners expected that he would soon be at their gates; but instead of advancing he made at first a retrograde movement. He returned to Hastings. In taking this step he appears to have had a two-fold motive in view: to wait for reinforcements, to fill up his thinned ranks, from beyond sea, and to ascertain whether any portion of the surrounding Saxon population would own him as their king. No one tendered his submission; but when reinforcements arrived he resumed his march, keeping close to the sea-coast, and spreading devastation in his route. Romney was burned to the ground, and its population massacred: Dover was captured. The capture of this "lock and key of all England" was of the greatest importance to William. It was a safe receptacle for his sick soldiers—a dreadful dysentery having broken out among them—and it commanded the best landing-place for fresh troops from the continent. Many of the warriors which William had brought with him from Normandy died at Dover; but having received further reinforcements, and at length being encouraged by the submission of the people of Kent, he advanced from the coast, and marched along Watling Street to London.

In those days the population of London was great, and its citizens warlike. There was stern patriotism within its walls, for the citizens loved their Saxon monarchs. When William appeared before its southern suburbs its population was also increased by numerous thanes and chiefs with their retainers, who had come from the neighbouring counties to attend the Witan. That a formidable front was shown is evident, for William, fearing to attack the metropolis, after setting fire to Southwark, marched rapidly into the country, to destroy and lay waste the property of the absent thanes. Detachments of his army were despatched to various quarters. The people of Surrey, Sussex, and Hampshire felt their vengeance. Towns and villages were destroyed, females violated, and men massacred. William formed an entrenched camp at Wallingford, and leaving a division there to cut off any succours that might be sent towards London, he marched across Buckinghamshire into Hertfordshire. Ruin and slaughter marked his route till he came to Berkhampstead, where he established his head-quarters. Entrenched camps were formed in all the sur-

rounding counties, so that London was now environed by the enemy.

Meanwhile Edgar did little more than wear the insignia of royalty. He was a mere cipher; for there was nothing popular about him except his descent. A few acts of legal authority were performed in his name; but the primate Stigand, one of the bitterest enemies William had in all England, was the prime mover of these acts. But it soon became apparent that opposition was useless. London was in a state of siege, there was a prospect of famine, and there were no able leaders to lead its warlike and patriotic citizens out to battle. The Earls Edwin and Morcar had retired with their warriors into Northumbria and Mercia; thus weakening the chances of resistance. At length hope fled: there was no alternative but submission. Before this was made, the Earls Edwin and Morcar appear to have returned to the metropolis, but they showed no inclination to risk a battle. The Witan, therefore, resolved that a deputation should be sent from London to Berkhampstead to offer William the crown. The puppet King Edgar was one of this deputation: the others being Stigand the primate, the Earls Edwin and Morcar, with other prelates and thanes of less note. William received the deputation courteously: even saluting his known enemy Stigand as "father" and "bishop." But it was his policy on such occasions to be courteous. The throne was offered to him, but he was not yet established thereon: when he was, then would be the time for him to take vengeance on his sworn enemies. So he received the deputation with complacency; and while they swore allegiance to him, he on his part promised to be mild and merciful to them and to all men.

Leaving hostages with William, the Saxon deputies returned to London. They were followed by the Normans, who spread havoc and destruction on their march as before. William himself did not venture to enter London. It seems probable that he had no faith in the loyalty of its citizens to his person; for while he sent a portion of his troops to build a fortress for his reception, he encamped, with the main body of his army, at some distance from the city. The fortress erected for his reception was the germ of what afterwards became the Tower so famous in the annals of English history. As soon as it was finished William took possession of it, and the Normans fixed his coronation for a few days after: Christmas Day, A.D. 1066.

The coronation of William, who from this time is styled the Conqueror, was attended by accidents and circumstances of a highly irritating character to the Saxon population. He had saluted Stigand as his "father" and "bishop" when he waited on him at Berkhampstead to offer him the crown, but he appears to have refused to be crowned and consecrated king by that primate. That honour was conferred on Aldred, archbishop of York. The coronation took place in the new Abbey of Westminster, which during the ceremony was surrounded by armed Normans. Aldred put the question to the English whether they would have William for their king, and the same question was put to the Normans by the bishop of Constance. Both English and Normans gave their assent in one voice, though not in the same lang and their shouts and cheers echoed round the w the abbey. Their acclamations were product fatal consequences. The shouts within the were taken for a cry of alarm by the Norman outside its walls, and as they had received ord be on the alert in case of any seditious or treach movement, they rushed to the adjacent wood houses of the English and set them on fire. At of the flames the tumult became as great with without the walls of the abbey. The Normans ceived that the Londoners had risen against and the English were impressed with an idea they had been brought thither unarmed and de less to be massacred. There was a wild upro the midst of which the spectators rushed from abbey, and the ceremony was hastily complete the trembling prelates. This incident exaspe the English against the Normans, and greatly nished their confidence in their new monarch. I a bad augury for the peace of his kingdom.

THE TOWER, LONDON.

At his coronation William took the usual oath he would rule with equity; and for a brief period oath was respected. But he had a difficult tas his new government. He had to please the peop two nations who were sternly averse to each o On the one hand he had to satisfy the rapacious mans for their services; and on the other to pitiate the English, over whom he had triumph with the sword. The estates of the crown wer by virtue of his kingship, and those of Ha family were confiscated; but these were not suffi to satisfy his Norman followers. He would not, ever, yet give them more, for there were many pc ful nobles in England, as Earls Edwin and Mc whose domains he dared not yet touch. It w have been dangerous to have laid hands on estates, for they still had their good swords to de

CORONATION OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

them which they were resolved to do to the utmost. As yet therefore William exhorted his Norman followers to patience and moderation—their rewards were to come. In the meantime some of the English nobles were welcomed at his court, and Edgar Atheling was treated with great kindness. The Earls Edwin and Morcar, Ederic, surnamed the Forester, and other English nobles, were confirmed in the possession of their honours and estates. William, also, adopted other measures well calculated to make him popular among his new subjects. Thus he regulated the collection of his revenues so that the burthen should not be oppressively felt by any class; and he provided for the safe passage of traders, and the transport of merchandize by sea and land. These conciliatory measures, however, were accompanied by others of a threatening character. The fortress of London was erected for the purpose of overawing its population, and castles were built near all the chief cities in the kingdom for the same object. As a matter of course the custody of these strongholds was given to his Norman followers. William Fitz-Osborne was placed in a castle at Winchester as lieutenant of the South; and Odo, bishop of Bayeux, his half-brother, in Dover Castle as governor of Kent. All rule was intrusted to Norman chiefs, for William had no faith in the fidelity of his English subjects. But this only tended to irritate them; and they were further irritated by marriages which he enforced between his Norman followers and the widows and heiresses of those who had been slain in the battle of Hastings. Other causes bred discontent among the English. Many priests and monks came over with William from the continent, all of whom demanded preferment, and he very early commenced to satisfy their demands. It was evident, indeed, that the Norman knights and barons, and the Norman priests and monks, would not let him rest till they had the fat of the land in their possession. One bright exception, however, is mentioned by Orderic. "Guilbert, the son of Richard," he says, "neither asked for estates nor a rich English wife, but declared that having served his liege lord in England as a true and faithful vassal he would return to Normandy to enjoy his lawful inheritance, without coveting that which belonged to others, or sharing in stolen property."

While yet the north and the west of England were untouched by the conqueror, and the people of the south were moody and discontented; and while yet his followers were anxious to provoke an insurrection and resume the war, that they might obtain possession of the estates still in the hands of the rightful Saxon owners, in the spring of A.D. 1067 William passed over into Normandy. He set sail from Pevensey near Hastings. In his train there were Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury; Edgar Atheling; the Earls Edwin and Morcar; Waltheof, earl of Northampton and Huntingdon; Ethelnoth, abbot and lord of Canterbury, and many other nobles. It is said that he took these with him under pretence of doing him honour, but in reality as a precaution for preserving the peace of his dominions during his absence; for not without reason he suspected their fidelity. William was received with great joy by his Norman subjects. And no wonder, for he did not return to them empty-handed. He carried with him great wealth, the fruit of blood and plunder, part of which, with the banner of Harold, he sent to the pontiff of Rome; and another portion of which he distributed among the abbeys, monasteries, and churches of Normandy. His Norman subjects were amazed at his success and the amount of his ill-gotten wealth; and nobles and princes from neighbouring countries, who visited his court to congratulate him on his achievements, gazed upon his treasures with admiration—not perchance unmixed with envy. The quantity and exquisite workmanship of his gold and silver plate, and the magnificence of the English nobles, exceeded everything that had been seen by the Normans, and in their estimation there was no country like England.

The spring, the summer, and the autumn passed away, and William still remained in Normandy. But why did he go, and why did he remain? These are questions not easy of solution. It has been supposed by some writers that he went thither out of pure vanity: that is, to show himself as the conqueror of England to his continental subjects. That is not consistent with his character. Others have imagined that he went to Normandy to deposit his ill-gotten wealth in a place of safety. That is scarcely tenable, for William had not all the booty he might have had, much of it yet remaining in the hands of his English subjects. Hume seems to be more correct in his conjecture. He conceived that William went to the continent from a concealed policy: that, finding he could neither satisfy his followers nor secure his government without further exerting the right of conquest, and seizing the remaining possessions of the English, he went thither in the hope that, while absent, insurrections would occur justifying further violence. If this was his policy he could scarcely have left a fitter instrument to vex and rouse the English to resistance than his half-brother Odo, to whom, during his absence, he confided the regal power. Associated with Odo as councillors of state were William Fitz-Osborne, Hugo of Grantmesnil, Hugo de Montford, Walter Gifford, and William de Garenne: all men of unbounded avarice and bold daring. The rule of Odo and these barons was bitter in the extreme. They permitted their men-at-arms to insult and plunder the population with impunity, none daring to complain. The women were exposed to the grossest licentiousness, and there was no punishment but for those who asked for justice. So bitter was the Norman tyranny that many of the bravest and best of the English population went into voluntary exile. But there were still men bold enough to offer some resistance. There were risings in various parts of the south, and many a Norman caught outside the walls of his castle or garrisoned town met with well-merited vengeance. The men of Kent, who were the first to submit to William, finally broke out into open rebellion against his government. At their invitation, Eustace of Boulogne, who in the reign of Edward the Confessor made such a stir at Dover, and who was then at variance with William, came with a fleet to the coasts and attempted to capture Dover, but his expedition was unsuccessful. In the West, Edric the Forester was more successful. Edric had done homage to William for his extensive possessions on the Severn

and the confines of Wales, and he was desirous of living at peace with the Normans; but, chafed by the wrongs committed by Norman captains garrisoned at Hereford, he took up arms, and with the assistance of two Welsh princes he shut the Normans close up within the walls of the town, and became master of all the western parts of Herefordshire. There was disaffection and disquietude everywhere. There were risings of armed bodies in various parts of the kingdom: both where the Norman oppression had been felt, and where as yet it was only apprehended. There was, according to Orderic, a well-founded rumour abroad that a massacre like that perpetrated on the Danes was intended; and it is certain that the feelings of the English were enraged to the highest pitch, and that the Conqueror's throne in England was in danger of being subverted. But William still lingered in Normandy. Messengers and letters were despatched to him, but for some time he took no notice of them: waiting probably till he conceived that sufficient provocation had been given for what his Norman followers so earnestly desired—further slaughter and confiscation. At length, however, leaving his queen Matilda and his son Robert regents of Normandy, he sailed on the 6th of December from Dieppe, and on the following day he landed at Winchelsea: the favourite residence of the Saxon monarchs.

William spent his Christmas in London. Here he assembled round him the English prelates and nobles. Ordericus relates that he received them all with open arms, and gave them the kiss of welcome. It proved to be the kiss of a Judas. An old charter in the archives of London, written in Anglo-Saxon, and supposed to have been penned on this occasion, reads thus:—"William the king friendly salutes William the bishop, and Godfrey the portreve, and all the burgesses within London, both French and English. And I declare that I grant you to be all lawworthy as you were in the days of King Edward; and I grant that every child shall be his father's heir, after his father's days, and I will not suffer any person to do you wrong. God help you!" God help them indeed! It is recorded that this document was read in all the churches of the metropolis, and that the Londoners believed the royal word; but William's first act undeceived them, for he imposed a burdensome tax upon them, after which he departed and carried his arms to the west and the north.

It was midwinter when William commenced his second campaign in England. It was opened in the fertile province of Devonshire. The people of Exeter, at the instigation of Girtha, the mother of King Harold, who resided there, had broken out into open rebellion, and had made preparations for a stern defiance. It was a city of great importance, thickly populated, and fortified with a wall, towers, and entrenchments. Its burghers had also gathered within its walls forces from other parts of Devonshire, and from the valiant people of Cornwall. William's army pitched their tents before Exeter in January, A.D. 1068, and he sent messengers to its burghers demanding submission. Their reply was defiant:—"We will neither swear allegiance to William, nor admit him within our walls, but will pay him tax such as we have been accustomed to pay to our kings." The truth is, William had exhausted his royal treasury in Normandy, and to replenish it he had revived the odious tax of Danegeld, which the brave burghers of Exeter resisted. If he had withdrawn that there would probably have been no need of fighting; but William had no idea of compounding the matter. It did not suit him, he said, to have subjects on such conditions. He pressed the siege, and some of the chief citizens resorted to his camp and implored his mercy. *They* proffered the submission of the city, and hostages for the fidelity of the burghers; but when William rode at the head of his cavalry, to take possession of Exeter, he found the gates barred and the walls manned with combatants who bade him defiance. The burghers had repudiated the offer of their timid leaders; and in order to intimidate them the Normans tore out the eyes of one of the hostages before their faces. This savage act had the effect of increasing the animosity and resistance of the citizens. After a siege of eighteen days, however, they were compelled to surrender, but according to the Saxon Chronicle it was because they had been again deceived by their chiefs. Girtha made her escape into Flanders, and a garrison was placed within the walls of Exeter, a castle being erected out of the ruins of forty-eight houses, which had been destroyed during the siege. After reducing Exeter, William marched into Cornwall, where he met with no resistance; from whence he returned eastward to Winchester, where he was joined by his wife Matilda, and where he spent the festival of Easter. Matilda was crowned queen at Winchester on Whitsunday, by Aldred, archbishop of York, and as this was contrary to the laws of the Anglo-Saxons it gave great offence to the people: an offence which was greatly heightened by the bestowal of confiscated territories in the west on his consecrated queen.

William did not tarry long at Winchester. He marched into Devonshire again, and then carried his arms through Somersetshire and Gloucestershire into Oxfordshire. The city of Oxford and other fortified cities were captured, and wherever he imposed his rule there the mass of lands was bestowed on his barons and knights. In his army at this time there were some English troops who fought against their own countrymen, but there is no record of any rewards being given to them. His largesses were reserved for his Normans and other foreigners who came flocking across the channel like birds of prey, in search of employment, wealth, and honours. At this time there were wholesale confiscations. Saxon proprietors were everywhere turned out of house and home. Some of them, thus rendered houseless and landless, retired to the thick forests with which the country still abounded, originating the bands of outlaws which existed for several successive reigns; while others made their way into the central and northern parts of the kingdom, resolving once more to strike for freedom.

Among these latter were Earls Morcar and Edwin. At the period of the battle of Hastings these powerful noblemen had about a third part of England under their authority, and that of their adherents; and they were, moreover, the favourites of that powerful order, the clergy, and the idols of the common people.

Fearing to provoke their resistance before his power had become established, William paid great court to these earls, and they, deceived by his blandishments, had been in amity with him. They had given their adhesion to his cause, Earl Edwin being induced to submit to him by a promise made to him by William that he would give him his daughter in marriage. That promise was broken. When Edwin claimed its fulfilment, feeling that he was now secure in his kingdom, William denied him the hand of the fair Norman; and indignant thereat, Edwin and his brother Morcar retired secretly to the north, and summoned the English and Welsh to their standard. Messengers were sent to every quarter to rouse the people to resist the Norman rule. The provinces beyond the Humber were the first to rise. The men of Yorkshire and Northumberland, and allies from the mountains of Wales, gathered together and formed a camp of independence, the city of York being its most southern bulwark. The feelings of the south were with them; and as for the clergy, they prayed heartily in secret that their efforts might be crowned with success. But it was in vain. With his usual celerity, William marched across the Humber, and coming upon the confederated hosts before the plans of their leaders were matured, they were quickly defeated. Edwin and Morcar submitted, and William gave them a seeming, but not a sincere forgiveness; but the wreck of their forces fled to the Humber, and descending that estuary in boats, they then sailed northwards to the borders of Scotland, the territories near which became the refuge of all the men of the north who would not submit to the hated Norman. The citizens of York who had engaged in this conspiracy made their peace by giving hostages and sending the keys of their city to William; but distrusting their fidelity, he built a strong citadel in York, and placed a Norman garrison therein to keep its burghers in awe. In this expedition, also, William captured Warwick, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, and Lincoln; in all of which he built castles and planted garrisons, after which he returned in triumph to the south.

By this time a considerable portion of the property of England was, by confiscations, transferred from the Saxons to the Normans. Many of the ancient English families were extinguished or reduced to poverty, and those who still retained their possessions lived in daily dread of ruin from the suspicions of the Conqueror, and the rapacity of his Norman favourites. Many retired into foreign countries for refuge, and to await better times. Among those who fled were Edgar Atheling, who, with his mother and sisters, retired into Scotland, where they were received with kindness by King Malcolm. Some of the English nobles had preceded Edgar to Scotland, and others followed him; and these emigrants, with others of a later period, became the founders of many noble Scottish families.

Although the retreat of so many of the English nobility weakened the country, and enriched the Normans with their spoils, there was as yet no tranquillity. In the year 1069, the two sons of Harold who had taken refuge in the court of Dermot, king of Ireland, having collected a small army and a fleet of sixty ships, landed with their troops on the coast of Devonshire, with the hope of retrieving the ruined fortunes of their family. Their expedition was abortive: many of their followers were slain by the Normans under the command of Briaux, a son of the Earl of Brittany, and they fled to their ships and returned to Ireland.

Internally the kingdom was everywhere in commotion. The garrisons which William had planted in the cities failed to keep the people in awe. On the contrary, they were in danger of being cut off by the surrounding population. Thus it was at York. So hostile were the people of the surrounding country, that the garrison of York, fearing that they should be besieged, collected all the provisions they could, and stored them up in the citadel, lest they should be reduced by famine before assistance could arrive. This led to an incident of an extraordinary character. While the Normans were thus providing for their safety, Aldred, archbishop of York, came to his cathedral to celebrate a festival. While there, his domestics were collecting corn and provisions from his lands near the city for the use of his household, and as they entered the gates with pack-horses and carts well laden, the Norman governor seized their stores, and they were carried to his magazines in the citadel. This was an outrage which Aldred could not brook. Leaving York he resorted to the camp of William, and presented himself before him in his pontifical robes, and holding his pastoral staff in his hand. William rose to give him his usual kiss of peace, but the outraged prelate held him aloof, and after reminding him that he had consecrated, blessed, and crowned him, he poured forth the bitterest maledictions on him and his race. The Norman nobles present would have slain the bold prelate, but William checked their rage, and Aldred returned to York, where he shortly after died. It seems probable that this incident increased the hostility of the people living around York against the Norman garrison. Soon after Aldred's death, indeed, William was compelled to undertake a second expedition to that city, and he arrived only just in time to prevent its capture by the men of the north. While at York, William laid the foundation of a second castle, and leaving a double garrison there he returned southward. No sooner, however, was he gone than commotions in the north were renewed. Everything seemed to conspire to the extirpation of the Normans. All that time wild bands of homeless Saxons lived in tents and watched their opportunity for vengeance. Before he returned southward, William had sent Robert de Comines, with about a thousand men-at-arms, to take possession of Durham. The march of that Norman band had been noted by the English. De Comines entered Durham, and took up his residence in the bishop's palace, while his followers quartered themselves in the houses of the burghers. But that night was fatal to the Normans in Durham. Answering to the signal-fires lit upon the hills, the people armed themselves; and before the day dawned the English burst into the city, and according to the old chronicles, of all those who were engaged in this expedition only two escaped. De Comines himself perished in the flames of the palace. Nor were these the only difficulties William was now called upon to encounter. Many of his Norman warriors, wearied

by their desultory and destructive warfare, retired from his service and returned to Normandy. It was in vain that he offered greater rewards and honours than he had yet bestowed upon them; in vain that they were called cowards for deserting their liege lord when thus surrounded by danger. They recrossed the channel, leaving their estates and their honours behind them, but taking with them much ill-gotten wealth for their support in their old homes. But there were thousands more on the continent ready to take the places of these recreant knights. The supply was equal to the demand. William confiscated all the estates of those who had deserted his cause, so that needy adventurers had a rich harvest of honour and rewards before them. The riches of England were not yet exhausted, and it was deemed worth the risk of life to seek a share in them. At the Conqueror's invitation, therefore, and allured by his brilliant offers, fresh bands of adventurers flocked into England from all quarters. They came from the banks of the Rhine, the Seine, the Loire, the Garonne, and the Tagus; and they came from the Alps and the Italian peninsula beyond them. But before they came it is evident that William had his doubts whether he should secure his conquests, for he sent his queen Matilda back to Normandy, that she at least might be in a place of safety.

It was well for William that he was thus enabled to obtain reinforcements, for a more formidable confederacy was forming against him than any he had yet encountered. The result of the battle of Hastings was no sooner known in Denmark than Sweyn king of that country, conceiving that by right of succession he also was the rightful heir to the English throne, contemplated a descent upon its coasts to assert that right. Diplomacy had delayed his enterprise; but at the time the Northumbrians struck the blow at Durham, they were expecting Sweyn to sail up the Humber to their aid. Being chiefly of Danish blood, the people of Danelagh had sent envoys to the court of the Danish monarch to solicit his assistance; and they were seconded by envoys from the Saxon population of England: all being alike desirous of putting an end to the domination of the hated Normans. At the same time Malcolm, king of Scotland, and his guest Edgar Atheling, with the English refugees in that country, entered into an alliance with the Northumbrians to overthrow the throne of the conqueror. Sweyn despatched a fleet of two hundred and forty sail, under the command of his brother Osbeorn: his two sons Harold and Canute accompanying the expedition. The troops, like those of William, were for the most part mercenaries; for besides Danes there were Holsteiners, Frisians, Saxons, Poles, and other adventurers from various parts. The invaders sailed to the Humber in August, and they where there joined by a fleet under Edgar Atheling and some English earls. The combined forces sailed up the Humber to the Ouse, where they landed, and where they were joined by Danes and Saxons from all quarters. At that time the people of York had surprised and slain Robert Fitz-Richard their governor, with many of his Normans, and were besieging the castle. The combined forces marched to their aid. The Normans defended their stronghold bravely; but defence was useless. They had sent messengers to William to represent their danger, but he was far away and could afford them no relief. There was no alternative but to surrender or die. They chose the latter. Having set fire to the houses nearest the castle, the flames of which spread in all directions and consumed the cathedral and great part of the city, the Norman garrison made a sally upon the besiegers, but in vain: three thousand Normans and men of different races fell by the sword, and only Malet the governor, with his wife and children and a few men, escaped the carnage; these being spared for the sake of ransom. The victory was complete, and if the confederates had made a rapid march southward they might have achieved a still more complete success; but instead of this the Danes, more intent on plunder than conquest, returned to their ships laden with booty, while the Northumbrians returned to their homes. Edgar Atheling remained amid the ruins of York, expecting Malcolm king of Scotland; but his promised army did not appear.

Meanwhile, William was preparing to take a deadly revenge. He was hunting in the forest of Dean when he heard of the slaughter of the Normans at York, and with a terrible oath he swore that not a single Northumbrian should escape his vengeance. Measures were instantly taken to put his threat into execution. Fresh troops were brought over from the Continent; and when he marched northwards, the old chroniclers record that such a force as he had collected had never before been seen in England. But William did not trust to the sword alone. He had gold, and he employed it to some purpose. He knew the character of the Danes—that they loved gold above all things—and he bribed the Danish chiefs so effectually that they retired from the contest. Moreover, as an inducement to quit the country, he granted permission to the Danish army to plunder the sea-coasts; and having done this, Osbeorn, in the spring of A.D. 1070, returned with his army into Denmark.

In the meantime William had taken the field. Impatient for revenge, he advanced at the head of his cavalry, leaving his infantry to follow by forced marches. As his army advanced the English everywhere rose in his rear; but, heeding not the danger behind him, he pressed forward. York was his destination and to York he came. It was defended by Earl Waltheof, who, though deserted by the recreant Danes, made a brave defence. York was not captured till many hundred English and Normans slept the sleep of death in one common grave. William was elated with his victory: he received Waltheof the brave defender of York into favour, and he spent the season of Christmas—the season of peace and goodwill towards men—with the usual festivities; but his revenge was not satisfied. He had sworn that he would never lay his lance in rest till he had exterminated the Northumbrians, and after planning fresh fortifications in York he proceeded northward to perform that deadly vow. His commanders were dispersed in separate divisions over a surface of a hundred miles, with orders to kill every one living, and to destroy everything that could minister to the sustenance of life. That order was obeyed to the very letter. From York to Durham every village was

red by fire and sword, and their inhabitants
vithout mercy; men, women, and children all
in one indiscriminate slaughter. Durham was
d. Led by Bishop Egelwin, its citizens crossed
me to Lindisfarne, carrying with them the
of St. Cuthbert their tutelary saint. From
n the infuriated Normans pushed forward to
me; devastation and slaughter still marking
nward course. It is on record that more than
red thousand victims perished, and that there
one to bury them. All the country from the
r to the Tees, and from the Wear to the Tyne,
a desert. Fourteen years after, when the
recorded in Domesday Book was completed—a
of which will be given in succeeding pages—
ds of Edwin and Morcar, of Waltheof, Cospa-
d Siward, Saxon lords, with those of the sees
k and Durham were entered as *wasta*, "laid
" and Malmesbury, writing half a century
ecords that the ground for more than sixty
was then uncultivated and unproductive. So
was the revenge that William inflicted on the
mbrians. Nor did their miseries end with the
n of his vengeance, for famine and pestilence
d in its wake, and to complete the picture of
some to escape death by famine, sold them-
with their wives and children, as slaves to the
hirsty Normans. Edgar Atheling with the
from Scotland, seeing all lost, escaped into
d by sea, where for some time they lived in

as at this period that William commenced a
of general confiscation. He became more the
than the king. His aim seems to have been to
and ruin his English subjects that they might
able again to disturb his government. All
y in land, whether belonging to those who
l him or took no part in the struggle, was
over by him to the Normans and other
ers. On every hand possessions were lavished
followers, while he himself seized upon the
es, which in those troublous times were de-
in the monasteries for safety. But though
perty of England in a great degree changed
, there was still a population left to till the
The great Norman chieftains would have
ie Conqueror but small thanks for their broad
s, if there were no herds to feed upon their
s and no one to till the ground. These chiefs,
were wiser and more merciful than William;
r gathered round them peaceful cultivators and
handicraftsmen. Thus, Alan of Brittany, to
ll the lands and villages, north of the city of
vhich had belonged to Earl Edwin, were al-
built a castle and town on a hill surrounded
ides by the river Swale, now Richmond; but
nghold would have been of little service to
there were not tillers of the land around it to
for the sustenance of his household and re-
In like manner the other chiefs, as William
y, who had eight manors bestowed upon him,
ot were surrounded by an industrious Saxon
ion to supply their wants. Ordericus, indeed,
it on record that the cultivators of the soil
l their labours in some sort of security, and

that the English and Normans shortly after the devastations of the north began to intermarry. The old proprietors of the lands were dispossessed, and thousands of the population had perished by the sword, famine, and pestilence; but there were still English tenants and serfs remaining. It is true mention is made of the arrival of peasant emigrants from Gaul; and some may have been brought over by their fortunate countrymen to assist in the tillage of the land, but there was no extensive colonization of that nature. The Saxon race might be trodden down and despised, as in truth it was; but it was not destroyed: it lived again to rise to greatness.

After the close of his bloody campaign in the north, William led back his army to check the insurrections in his rear, and subdue the country on the borders of Wales. These insurrections had been partially suppressed by his lieutenants, but still the whole of the north-west was in a very insecure state. That there was danger is proved by the hot haste William made to avert it. Although the weather was inclement, and his troops fatigued by their toils, he urged them forward to Chester. Ordericus has thus described this march:—"With unwearied vigour he made his way through roads never before travelled by horses; across lofty mountains and deep valleys, rivers and rapid streams, and dangerous quagmires in the hollows of the hills. Pursuing their track, they were often distressed by torrents of rain, sometimes mingled with hail. At times they were reduced to feed on the flesh of horses which perished in the bogs." Disheartened by their difficulties, his soldiers displayed a mutinous spirit; but William repressed it and cheered them on, and he at length reached Chester, and put down the insurrectionary spirit in Mercia. No defence was made at Chester; and while there Edric the forester, who had taken the town of Shrewsbury from the Norman garrison, and was one of the bravest leaders of the Saxons in those parts, submitted and was received into favour. The whole of Chester was granted to Hugh d'Avranches, who for his ferocious disposition was surnamed "the wolf." Hugh d'Avranches surrounded himself with a number of hungry adventurers fresh from the Continent; bestowing on them domains as lieutenants, constables, or seneschals, with whom he commenced a sanguinary warfare with the Welsh, which continued with but little intermission till the age of the Plantagenets, when Wales was finally subjugated. The blood of the Welsh was shed by Hugh the Wolf and his satellites like water, and their houses were burned to the ground, and their lands desolated. That honest historian of the times, Ordericus, represents the adventurers in William's army as "ignorant upstarts, driven almost to madness by their sudden elevation;" and certainly such a character was Hugh the Wolf.

Having restored his rule in Mercia, William repaired to his palace at Winchester, where he turned reformer of the Church: that is, he purified it by ejecting the Saxon prelates and monks, and replacing them by Normans and other foreigners. In this holy work he was assisted by three legates sent expressly for that purpose from the pope. It was now that he took his revenge on Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury who had opposed his claim to the crown: Stigand was

deposed. On every hand the Saxon clergy were driven from the monasteries, and monks from Normandy peopled their cells. Ingulphus, an Englishman, was appointed abbot of Croyland, but he had been bred in Normandy, and had been secretary to the Conqueror, and with this exception, the possessions of the Church were bestowed on the Norman clergy. Some of the Saxon prelates were set aside on the plea that they led criminal lives and were ignorant of their pastoral duties; but this was mere pretence. At all events they were as good pastors as many of those who assumed their offices, who were for the most part men of ambition, and caring for nothing but wealth and dignities. At the same time some of the Norman clergy were humble and self-denying. It is recorded of one named Guitmond that when offered a bishopric by William he replied that he looked upon England as one vast heap of booty, "and that he was as much afraid to touch it and its treasures, as if it were a burning fire."

Before Ingulphus was installed abbot of Croyland, that "region of waste waters encompassing patches of fertility" became the scene of a notable struggle for Saxon nationality. In that part Hereward, lord of Born in Lincolnshire, and "England's darling," still defied the Conqueror. Hereward was one of the most resolute Saxon chiefs the Normans ever had to encounter. He had expelled the foreigners who had taken possession of his patrimony, had assisted his neighbours to do the same, and had established a fortified camp in the Isle of Ely where he raised the banner of independence. His power extended over the fen country of Lincolnshire, Huntingdon, and Cambridge: a country which became a sort of holy land of the English. The abbeys of Ely, Peterborough, Thorney, and Croyland were situate within its limits; and thither in their distresses, came Saxon refugees of all classes: thanes deprived of their lands, bishops of their mitres, and abbots and monks driven from their monasteries. Hereward's camp of refuge was the only place where a chance of security was offered to the persecuted Saxons. He was not a belted knight, but his uncle, abbot of Peterborough, had blessed his sword, and he used it valiantly. Ivo Taillebois, the lord of Holyland, led a great force against him, but he was repulsed again and again. That "son of the fire eternal" was a plague to the monks of Croyland, but he was no match for Hereward in the day of battle. His forces seemed invincible. Around him was gathered the chivalry of the Saxon race; and the jealousy of the Conqueror increased his strength. The earls Edwin and Morcar had during the recent struggles respected their oath of allegiance to William, but his jealousy of them drove Morcar to Hereward's camp of independence. Edwin endeavoured to escape into Scotland, but he was betrayed by some of his followers into the hands of the Normans, and was slain. At first, William despised the insurgents of the fens. He was, however, soon convinced that Hereward was no mean foe. It was not the trifling outbreak he conceived it to be: it was a bold stroke for freedom. Convinced of this, William at length moved forward with a formidable army to quell the rebellion against his power. But he had difficulties to encounter. There was a swamp to cross which no cavalry could pass over. In every direction the country was intersected by rivers, streams, and broad meres; and the few roads that led through the dangerous labyrinth were well defended by brave Saxons. In order to obtain access to Hereward's camp, William commenced the erection of a great causeway, but his labour proved vain; issuing from the bogs and tall rushes, Hereward's followers ever and anon cut off his labourers, and the work made no progress. The Normans believed that Hereward was in league with the powers of darkness; and William, who was equally superstitious as his followers, placed a Norman sorceress in a wooden tower to be the guardian of the causeway. But William's sorceress was not proof against fire. Hereward set fire to the dry reeds and rushes, and the wind fanning the flames, the tower with the witch and all therein were involved in one common ruin. But what force and contrivance could not effect, was brought about by treachery. The profession and vowed duties of the monks of Ely included fasting; but they became impatient at the privations they were called upon to endure by this contest. They longed again to eat wheaten bread, and to feast on flesh food. How could they chant as in aforetime merrily, without such good cheer? These monks of Ely, therefore, struck a bargain with William. On condition that they were left in the possession of their houses and lands undisturbed, they undertook to show him a passage across the fens; and, led by these infamous monks, the Normans entered the isle, occupied the monastery, and finally stormed their entrenchments. Resistance was vain: many perished, and the rest laid down their arms. Earl Morcar was captured and was imprisoned for years, as was also the bishop of Durham. Hereward escaped to his own estate in Lincolnshire, where, with some faithful adherents he carried on a partizan warfare for some time; but he finally submitted, and, enjoyed the estates of his ancestors to the day of his death.

Meanwhile the standard of independence had again been raised in the north. After carrying fire and sword throughout the whole of Northumberland, William had received Cospatric, one of the Saxon exiles of Scotland, who had fought against him, into favour, and had intrusted him with the government of that part of the country. Whether Cospatric proved treacherous, or whether he had not the power to keep the Northumbrians in awe, is not certain; but bands of insurgents had again gathered together, and had invoked the presence of Edgar Atheling to aid them in their attempts to throw off the Norman yoke. William again, therefore, marched northwards, and the confederates were driven beyond the Tweed. He crossed that river to seize the English emigrants and punish Malcolm, king of Scotland; but though he advanced from the Tweed to the Frith of Forth with the whole of his cavalry and a large body of infantry, no exploits were performed by him in Scotland. No emigrants were either captured or given up to him; but Malcolm, overawed by his power; made peace with him and delivered hostages, and then William "went home with all his force." On his return, Cospatric was deprived of the earldom of Northumberland, which was bestowed upon Waltheof, who had likewise been an exile in Scotland.

After a seven years' fearful struggle, England was now, A.D. 1073, prostrate beneath the feet of the Conqueror: by force and cunning he had destroyed the Saxon independence. The Saxon people had fought bravely to sustain their nationality, but they were overmatched. At this interval of peace in England his presence was required in his continental dominions. There was a revolt in Maine, fomented by Fulk, earl of Anjou, and he left England with an army consisting chiefly of his English subjects to quell it. In that war he committed similar mischief to that which he had perpetrated in England. The revolt was quickly quelled, and he was recalled to England by another of a much more threatening nature. This time it was not a revolt of the English, but of the Norman barons. Roger FitzOsborn, earl of Hereford, had promised his sister in marriage to Ralph de Guader, earl of Norfolk: thus uniting their interests. Application was made to William for his consent to the nuptials; but his tyranny extended over the rights of families, as well as over the nation at large, and he forbade the union. Probably he considered that the power of the two earls, if thus cemented, might prove dangerous to his throne. The earls, however, took no notice of this prohibition: the wedding took place, and there was a great feast at Norwich in honour of the bridal of Emma FitzOsborn with Earl de Guader. Many prelates and barons were there, and among them was Waltheof, to whom William had given his niece Judith in marriage. As the wine-cup went round, there was much plain speaking: the bride's father inveighing against the conduct of William in reference to the union of his daughter with De Guader. It was an insult, he said, offered to the memory of his father, to whom the "bastard" owed his crown. By degrees, other lips were opened; the Normans denounced the Conqueror's ingratitude, the Saxons, his oppression. Men generally become more and more courageous as they sit over their wine-cups, and so it was on this occasion. Out of their first murmurs grew a plot against William's throne. Earl Waltheof was pressed to join in the conspiracy; and though he appears to have refused to take any active part in the matter, he did what was equivalent to being a party to it—he promised to keep the secret. But he did not keep it. Having confidence in his wife Judith, he disclosed the secret to her: and it is said also to Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury under the seal of confession. Judith proved faithless: her affections had been secretly fixed on another object, and glad of an opportunity of ruining her husband, she sent a messenger to her uncle in Normandy, to warn him of his danger. But before William could arrive, the conspiracy was crushed. By the advice of Lanfranc, Waltheof himself went into Normandy to communicate the whole of the affair to William, as the most effectual means of obtaining his forgiveness, and the conspirators hearing of his flight, flew to arms before their plot was ripe for execution. The earl of Hereford was defeated and taken prisoner by Norman troops as he was making his way towards the Severn with his followers; and the earl of Norfolk was attacked by a royal army under the command of Odo, the bishop of Bayeux, who obtained a complete victory. De Guader fled to Brittany, leaving his bride to defend his castle at Norwich, which she surrendered, and then went into exile. William who was still in Normandy, invaded Brittany, in the hope of exterminating him in his native castle, and reducing that province to subjection, but he was defeated by the Bretons, who were supported by the French king, and he returned to England to decide on the fate of the conspirators. The Norman leaders were sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, but a more cruel fate was awarded to their adherents; many of them being hanged, and others either blinded or mutilated. The most conspicuous victim was Waltheof. The heartless Judith did all she could to insure his death: even accusing him of inviting over a Danish fleet, which at that time appeared on the coast of Norfolk, to aid in the conspiracy. His great possessions, however, were more the cause of his ruin than the perfidy of Judith. The Norman courtiers thirsted for his blood that they might possess his honours and estates; and it was in vain that Lanfranc endeavoured to save the noble Saxon. His faithless wife and enemies prevailed. After lingering a year in prison, he was beheaded at Winchester, and his memory was long regarded by the Saxon population as a saint and martyr. As for his perfidious wife Judith, she became the scorn of both Normans and Saxons. Instead of allowing her to marry the man of whom she was enamoured, William insisted on giving her hand to a Frenchman named Seniore, who was lame and deformed, and when she rejected the match, he confiscated her estates and she ended her days in poverty and seclusion.

After the revolt of the nobles had been utterly crushed, William returned to Normandy. There is no trace of him in England for seven or eight years. That space is filled up by narratives of his continental wars, which scarcely belong to English history, and of his family quarrels. In condemning William's wholesale massacre in the north, the honest historian, Ordericus, had said that such barbarity could not pass unpunished; and he was right. He had wounded others without mercy, and he was now wounded himself by the sharp tooth of filial disobedience. He had promised that if he should succeed in the conquest of England, he would resign the duchy of Normandy to his eldest son Robert; but when he was firmly seated on his English throne, he was determined to keep and rule both his continental duchy and his insular kingdom. It was in vain that Robert urged his performance of his promise: he first demurred, and then flatly refused to resign any of his territories while he lived. Robert was brave, ambitious, and impatient of command, and being surrounded by men equally ambitious as himself, he was led to rebel against his father. But the immediate cause of Robert's revolt was a quarrel with his brothers William and Henry. The incident which led to that quarrel was trifling in itself, but it was important in its consequences. William, who was twenty-one years of age, took part against Robert, but Henry, who was only nineteen years old, probably had no feeling in the matter. Be that as it may, as these brothers were playing together in the gallery of a house at Maine, they amused themselves by throwing water on Robert and his companions, who were walking in a court below. This

was taken as the direst insult by the fiery Robert. Instigated by his companions, he drew his sword and ran up-stairs to the gallery, vowing he would wipe out the insult with blood. Their father interposed; but Robert would neither forgive nor be appeased. He fled to Rouen and raised the standard of rebellion. The parent and the child met in battle, and the father was unhorsed by the son. Perceiving whom he had at his mercy, Robert relented and begged forgiveness; but the stern William would not be reconciled, and after a few years of secret hostility, they never met again.

"They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
Like cliffs which had been rent asunder."

There was another breach in this ambitious family. Odo, half-brother of the Conqueror, was ambitious of becoming Pope. He had done William good service with the sword. He had fought bravely for him in the battle of Hastings and in subsequent conflicts; and when absent in Normandy, Odo had sustained the integrity of his kingdom. Though a prelate, he was William's ready instrument when any bloody work was to be done and he was out of the way to execute it personally. His last act was to avenge the death of Walcher, bishop of Durham. Walcher was a Lorrainer, and he lorded it over the English with a high hand. He not only imposed heavy burdens on those within his jurisdiction, but he permitted his officers and men-at-arms to plunder, insult and even murder them, with impunity. One Leulf, an English nobleman, had been robbed by some of the bishop's retainers, and when he sought redress, it was denied. Soon after, Leulf was murdered in his own house by Walcher's men-at-arms, and enraged by the foul deed, the Northumbrians surrounded his palace; and when he and his murderous crew fled to the church for sanctuary, they burned it to the ground and all therein perished. Odo was commissioned by William to avenge the death of the bishop of Durham; and a fearful vengeance he took. There was no resistance made by the Northumbrians, but the whole province was treated as insurgent. Without any judicial form

NAVE, DURHAM CATHEDRAL.

of trial hundreds were beheaded, while others, after the manner of William's brutal policy, were mutilated; the most common mode of mutilation being the cutting off of the right foot. By this brutal expedition, Odo earned for himself the reputation of being one of the greatest dominators of the English: and yet at this very time he was ambitious of becoming Christ's vicar on earth.

In order to secure the papal dignity, Odo had amassed immense treasures. He had enriched himself greatly in his last expedition; for many had purchased their lives by giving him all they possessed. His riches were employed both at home and abroad to further the ends of his ambition. Costly presents were sent to the senators of Rome; and he had astrologers there in his pay who were constantly predicting that when Gregory VII., who was an old man, was dead, Odo would, according to the stars, be his successor. In the full belief that he was about to ascend the papal throne, Odo resolved to visit Rome to insure his election when the next pope was wanting. He had plenty of gold; and he knew that gold was all-powerful in the College of Cardinals. Many of the Norman chiefs entered into Odo's views, and agreed to go to Rome with him: their object being partly to have their consciences washed from the guilt of blood and plunder. But Odo and the Norman barons were indulging in a dream never to be realized. They had made great preparations for their departure, but on its eve, William, by one fell blow, crushed Odo's ambition, and set the projected journey aside. He was unwilling to allow so much treasure to be carried out of the kingdom, and setting sail for England, he surprised Odo in the Isle of Wight as he was about to embark, seized all his treasures, and summoned him before his barons. Heavy accusations were made against him. He stood charged with abusing his power, both as viceroy and judge; with maltreating the English beyond measure; with robbing the churches; and, finally, with seducing and attempting to carry the warriors of the king to Rome when their services were needed for the security of his throne. Instead of going to Rome, Odo was sent to a dungeon in the castle of Rouen in Normandy, where he remained till the death of the king. This strange act of William obtained for him considerable popularity among the English; but which was the more guilty of the two—the king or the bishop—he who reads this section of history aright will readily perceive. It is certain, indeed, that some of Odo's most atrocious crimes had been committed, not only by William's sanction, but by his positive commands.

Soon after William had sent his uterine brother to a dungeon, he returned to Normandy, his queen, Matilda, being at the point of death. Matilda died in the autumn of A.D. 1083; and it is said that the Conqueror, who had tenderly loved her, was so much affected by her decease that he relinquished all his amusements. At the same time he became more jealous of his old companions in arms, and displayed a greater greed for gold than ever. But the remaining years of his life were clouded with anxieties. His greatest uneasiness arose from a newly-threatened invasion of the Danes. In the year 1084, Canute IV., king of Denmark, who, like William, was illegitimate,

laid claim to the English throne as successor of Canute the Great, and made preparations for the enforcement of his claim. A confederacy was formed for that purpose. Olaf, king of Norway, supplied sixty ships in aid of the enterprise, and Robert, earl of Flanders, Canute's father-in-law, manned and equipped six hundred vessels. In all, the united armament amounted to about one thousand sail. To repel this invasion, William collected a large army of Normans and mercenaries, whom he brought over to England and quartered on his English subjects, reviving the odious Danegeld for their maintenance. Great distress was occasioned in England at this period, for not only were the people burdened with this tax, but all the lands lying near the sea-coast were laid waste, so that if the Danes should land, they would not find either food or forage. But they did not land. Contrary winds, and dissensions among his nobles, compelled Canute to abandon his expedition, and after the lapse of two years, William dismissed his mercenaries, to the great joy of the English.

Thus relieved from invasion, it appears from the Saxon Chronicle that it was at this period, A.D. 1085, that William "sent his servants through all the country to make a survey of every possession, and to register every hide of land in every county, and what was the money value, and what cattle were maintained upon each property." This register of survey, called "Domesday Book," is still preserved in the chapter-house of Westminster Abbey, and is one of the most precious documents of English history. The survey was conducted by commissioners, who collected information upon oath, in each county, of the following particulars:—The name of every town or village; who held them in the days of Edward the Confessor, and who when the survey was taken; how many freemen, villeins, and cottagers were resident in them; how many hides of land were in each manor; how many of these were in the demesne; how much woodland, meadow, and pasture; how much it paid in taxes in King Edward's time, and how much in William's; and how many mills and fish-ponds there

SEAL OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

were. In some instances, the commissioners were even more explicit; taking an account of the horses, black cattle, swine, sheep, and hives of bees. The corn-growing land, as well as meadows and pastures, were carefully registered, both as to their extent and value. The value of woods was itemed down with equal exactness. At that time timber was not of any great commercial value, arising from its abundance; and the value of a tree was estimated according to the number of hogs that could lie under it, as in the time of the Saxons. It was the acorns and beechmast that constituted the real value of a tree; not its timber. Thus, it is recorded that the Bishop of London's demesne at Fulham could fatten a thousand hogs, while the "pannage" of others could only fatten from two to three hundred, and others none at all, neither oak nor beech growing thereon. By this survey, William acquired an exact knowledge of the possessions of the crown, the church, the nobility, and landowners; and it confers greater honour on his memory than all his victories.

Only five forests are mentioned in this record,—Windsor, Gravelings, Winburn, Whichwood, and New Forest. No doubt there were numerous other forests; but as they were not objects of assessment they were unnoticed. The New Forest is intimately associated with William's memory, covering it with disgrace and dishonour. The Saxon Chronicle says that William "loved wild beasts as if he had been their father;" and it is certain that he was more careful of them than he was of his subjects. For thirty miles, from Salisbury to the sea, and in circumference nearly ninety miles, the lands of Hampshire were laid waste to form this his favourite hunting-ground. Villages and towns were depopulated, and even churches destroyed, that the country might be preserved for the habitation of wild beasts to administer to his pleasure. According to Ordericus not less than sixty parishes, in which there was a numerous and industrious population, were thus laid waste. There was no artificial plantation, as some have supposed, but chases were opened through ancient thickets, and the villages were destroyed in order that there might be no obstruction to the sport. Stringent laws were made

for the preservation of the beasts of the forest. The slaying of a man might be atoned for by the payment of a moderate fine; but whoever killed a stag or a deer in the royal domains were doomed to have their eyes torn out. That great cruelties were committed by William in the formation of New Forest, and by the laws enacted for the preservation of the wild beasts therein, is attested by tradition, which attributes the deaths of three of the Conqueror's posterity, which took place within its limits, to the judgment of God for his crimes. Even his own chaplain, in after days, writes thus in reference to the deaths of Robert and Rufus:—"There were many who held that the two sons of William the king perished by the judgment of God in these woods, since for the extension of the forest he had destroyed many inhabited places and churches within its circuit."

In the autumn of A.D. 1086 there was a great gathering at Salisbury. The Conqueror was there, and there also were prelates and abbots, barons and knights, with many of their vassals. The whole assemblage is said to have amounted to sixty thousand men. They assembled there, at the summons of William, to take the oath of allegiance and homage to him previous to his departure for Normandy. It was for the last time. Having received their pledges, William, accompanied by his two sons, William and Henry, passed over to the Continent, taking with him "a mighty mass of money, fitted for some great attempt." It was to make war with France. There was a dispute between him and Philip, the French king, concerning the right of possession of the city of Mantes, and the territory between the Epte and the Oise, and both monarchs appealed to the sword. On arriving in Normandy some attempts were made at negotiation, during which William fell sick and kept his bed. As he advanced in years he had grown corpulent, and Philip drove him to frenzy by a coarse joke he made about his corpulency. No doubt, he said, there would be a fine churching when he was delivered; and William swore, "by the splendour and resurrection of Christ," that there should be such a churching in Nôtre Dame: one at which there should be so many wax-torches that all France should be in a blaze. How he chafed under Philip's witticism may, from his fiery character, be readily imagined; he longed to remount his war-horse to revenge himself on the royal joker. He mounted it in July, A.D. 1086; a season for which he waited in order to make his vengeance more fearful. As he marched along, his cavalry rode through the corn-fields, then ripening for the harvest, causing a wide-spread desolation. His troops were soon before Mantes, which surrendered, and the city was reduced to ashes. This was the Conqueror's last act of devastation. As he rode up to see the ruin he had made, his horse put his foot on some hot cinders, and plunging, the rider was thrown heavily on the ground. He was carried in great pain on a litter to Rouen, and from thence to the monastery of St. Gervase, near that city. Here, surrounded by doctors, priests, and monks, he lingered for six weeks. His case was hopeless. How did the strong man meet his fate? The chroniclers relate that his heart was for the first time softened; that he sent money to rebuild the churches he had destroyed at Mantes; that he sent other moneys to the churches and monasteries in England, that he might obtain remission for the robberies he had committed there; and that to insure mercy of God he showed mercy to man, by consenting to relieve all the state prisoners—including his half-brother Odo—some of whom had pined in the dungeons of Normandy for more than twenty years. Ordericus adds that William also entertained his courtiers with long discourses on the vanity of worldly greatness.

Around the Conqueror's dying bed were his two sons William and Henry. Robert was at the court of France, hated by his father as bitterly as ever. He exhibited that hatred in his last will and testament. He could not deny him his right to the inheritance of Normandy, but he gave the brightest jewel of his crown—England—to William, recommending his instant journey there to take possession of it. To Henry he bequeathed five thousand pounds of silver; and while William hastened to England to insure his crown, Henry went straight to the treasury to take possession of his silver. And now came the end of the Conqueror's greatness. As the cathedral bell was tolling the hour of prime, on the ninth of September, he expired, in the fifty-third year of his age, and the twenty-first of his reign over England.

Two singular scenes occurred in connection with the death of William the Conqueror. As the breath passed out of his body his courtiers mounted their horses and galloped off to their several homes, and his servants and some minor vassals, after ransacking the royal apartments, followed their example. For three hours his corpse lay almost naked on the bare boards, none waiting to do honour to his mortal remains. At length some of the clergy and monks formed a procession, and went with a crucifix and tapers and incense to pray for the peace of his soul. He was buried in the church of St. Stephen, at Caën, which he had founded; and his interment was as remarkable for an extraordinary scene as his chamber of death. Mass had been performed, his panegyric had been pronounced, and his body was about to be lowered into the grave, when a voice exclaimed that the man whom the bishop of Evreux had extolled in his panegyric was a robber; that the land on which they stood had been taken by violence by him whereon to build his church. It was one Ascelin, the son of Arthur, who thus denounced the mighty dead, and he added, "I therefore openly demand its restoration, and in God's name I forbid the body of the spoiler being covered with my glebe." The truth of Ascelin's denunciation was well known; and, before the ceremony proceeded Ascelin received sixty shillings for the grave alone, and a promise from the bishop that he should be paid the full value of the remainder of the land, and then the body, dressed in royal robes, was lowered into the cold tomb. "O, secular pomp, how despicable art thou, because how vain and transient!"

Such was the end of William the Conqueror. His character may be deduced from the page of his history, but his portrait, drawn in quaint but true terms by a contemporary Saxon chronicler, may be interesting. After mentioning his mildness to the Norman clergy, and the subservient ministers of his will, he writes:—"He was a very stern and wrathful man, so that none

durst to do anything against his will. He removed bishops from their sees, abbots from their offices, and imprisoned thanes. In his time had men much distress. He took money by right and unright, and with little need. He made large forests for the deer, and enacted laws therewith, so that whoever killed a hart or a hind should be blinded. The rich complained, and the poor murmured, but he was so stern that he recked nought of them: they must will all that the king willed if they would live. Alas, that any man should so exalt himself in his pride over all!" But though this is true to the letter, it must be borne in mind that William lived in an age of turbulent spirits, and in the midst of circumstances which required a strong unbending will, such as he possessed, to control. And after all, though the miseries he inflicted upon the English people were great, who can say that his conquest has not proved a blessing to England? His conquest was permanent; many of his companions became one people with those they subdued; his posterity inherited his power, and, notwithstanding all the changes and revolutions of dynasties, the blood of the present reigning family is kindred to that of William the Conqueror.

SECTION II.

WILLIAM II., SURNAMED RUFUS.

William Rufus, or "the Red"—so called from the colour of his hair—heard of his father's death as he was about to embark at Wissant for England. This intelligence quickened his movements. He was anxious to obtain possession of the crown before any other claimant could appear in the field. On arriving in England he secured the fortresses of Dover, Pevensey, and Hastings, and then hurried forward to Winchester to take possession of his father's well-stored treasury. Sixty thousand pounds of silver, much gold, and many precious stones were there; a valuable aid to his exaltation to the throne. But there was no obstacle in William's way. Lanfranc, the primate, in whose hands the destinies of the kingdom may be said to have been, was the aspirant's old tutor, and it was not likely that he would offer any opposition. Moreover, the Conqueror had sent a letter to Lanfranc, recommending William to his guidance; and after he had given his promise upon oath that he would govern the kingdom according to law and right, and that he would consult him as primate on all important matters, both in Church and State, Lanfranc declared in William's favour. In order, however, to give the accession of William the semblance of a free election, Lanfranc summoned a council of prelates and barons to decide whether he should or should not be king over England. A strong feeling of opposition existed, but none was expressed; and therefore on the 26th of September, A.D. 1087, the primate crowned Rufus at Westminster.

Meanwhile Robert, the eldest son of the Conqueror, had returned from his exile to Normandy, where he was joyfully received by the prelates, barons, and chief men as their duke. Some of the more powerful of the Norman chiefs were averse to a divided sovereignty. Having possessions in both countries, they conceived that it would be better to have one king to rule over them. They felt that they could not serve two masters with any chance of securing the favour of both; that if they clung to William their Norman estates would be seized by Robert, and if they clung to Robert their possessions in England would be confiscated by William. They were thus on the horns of a dilemma. They had to choose between two masters; and the question was who should be their one ruler—Robert, or William? Their choice fell upon Robert; his character, which was one of easy good-nature influencing them in their decision. A conspiracy, therefore, was formed to dethrone William. Robert himself would have been satisfied with his dukedom, but he was told that it would be disgraceful to let a younger brother reign as king, while he only had a duchy, and that the state of England required his interference; and thus urged he consented to supplant his brother, if it could be accomplished. One of the most zealous of the conspirators was the fiery prelate Odo, who seems to have engaged in the conspiracy not so much out of any preference of one brother over another, as from a desire to wreak his vengeance on Lanfranc the primate, to whom he attributed his recent misfortunes. Odo, bishop of Bayeux, was the soul of the conspiracy. He was at Winchester with William, as his guest, at Easter, A.D. 1088, but he was all the while plotting against him, and no sooner was the Easter festival over than he departed to raise the standard of Robert in his old earldom of Kent. Other barons in the east, west, and north, followed his example. There was a dangerous rising in various quarters; but their designs were rendered abortive from the slowness of their operations. Robert had promised to come to England with an army when all things were ready; but he failed to appear. While waiting for them some of the Norman chiefs spent their time in acts of depredation, which proved fatal to their cause. Indignant at such treatment, the English, at the call of William, rallied round his standard, especially as his call was accompanied by most abundant promises. As the long-despised Anglo-Saxon chiefs gathered round him, he promised that he would rule them with the best laws ever known in England; they were to be relieved from many burdensome taxes; and they were even to have liberty to hunt in his forests, like their forefathers. Thus flattered and favoured, thirty thousand Englishmen stood forward to fight for King William. The conspiracy was soon crushed. Odo was besieged in the castle of Pevensey, which after seven weeks he was compelled to surrender, William granting him life and liberty on taking an oath that he would put Rochester Castle in his hands, and then leave the kingdom for ever. Rochester Castle was in the hands of Eustace, count of Boulogne, an adherent of Robert's, and Odo was sent thither with a strong escort; but on his arrival there, by a secret understanding between him and Eustace, both he and the escort were arrested, and the treacherous Odo continued the struggle. But it was in vain. Rochester Castle was besieged, and the garrison, reduced by famine and disease, was finally compelled to capitulate. At the intercession of the Norman portion of William's army, the besieged were allowed to march out with their arms and horses,

and freely to depart the land; and though when Odo marched out the English raised a loud cry for vengeance, he left England in safety and never returned. The other disaffected nobles in the east, west, and north were afterwards subdued or propitiated; some of them escaped into Normandy, and some received a pardon. The estates of Odo and other Norman chiefs were confiscated, many of which were bestowed on such of the barons as had done Rufus best service, and the rest he retained in his own possession.

William proved a faithless monarch to his English subjects. While Lanfranc lived he ruled mildly and justly, but after his death, which occurred A.D. 1089, his rule was that of a tyrant. All his promises to the English, who had contributed so much to the establishment of his throne, were soon forgotten. No successor was appointed to the primacy; and the rich revenues of the see of Canterbury were seized by Rufus, and spent in revelry. Lanfranc had been chief minister as well as primate: a post which was given to a Norman clerk of the name of Ralph: a man who had been a spy and public informer in the court of the Conqueror. Ralph became royal chaplain, treasurer, and justiciary; but his chief duty was to raise as much money as he could for the Red King's pleasure. Instead of relief, therefore, the burdens of the English people were made heavier. The forest laws became more stringent than ever. To hunt in them was made a capital crime, as a source of pecuniary profit; so much money being extorted from offenders to redeem them from death. In order to raise the revenues of the crown, a new survey was also commenced, under the plea that many estates had been underrated in the Domesday Book. But the most flagrant act of injustice resorted to for the support of the crown, and to gratify the Red King's rapacity, was the seizing of all the revenues of bishoprics and abbeys that fell vacant by death. So violent were the measures adopted by Ralph the Norman minister, that he obtained the surname of Le Flambard—"the destructive torch."

The Red King was not so prone to forget injuries as benefits. It was at the instigation of the Norman chiefs that Robert had conspired to subvert his throne, but it aroused his fiercest resentment against that brother. As he had sought to deprive him of a kingdom, he resolved to deprive Robert of a dukedom. And there were many circumstances which favoured his taking such a revenge. While the Norman chiefs were fighting in England for Robert, he had been doing great wrong to his commonwealth. By his liberality he had been destroying its resources; and the natural consequence was that his dominions had fallen into a complete state of anarchy. William was not slow in taking advantage of this circumstance to have his revenge. He resolved to drive him out of Normandy. And this appears to have been one cause of Ralph le Flambard's cruel extortions on the English nation. Gold was wanting for the purposes of corruption and war. By means of bribery several fortresses were taken, and Rouen itself was, through the Red King's intrigues, soon in danger. In this emergency Robert had recourse to his brother for assistance. Under financial pressure he had sold Henry the province of Contentin, which formed a third portion of his duchy; and having an i the preservation of the entire dukedom, H sponded to his brother's solicitations. He c his retainers to Rouen, and through his bol revolt was quelled. This occurred A.D. 109 the following year Rufus himself appeared mandy at the head of an English army. Ro called in the French king to his aid, throug mediation the brothers became reconciled. treaty of peace which was concluded at Caë retained possession of all the fortresses acq bribery in Normandy, and Robert solemnly re all claim to the English throne. But no soo Robert and William become reconciled th quarrelled with their brother Henry. He his five thousand pounds of silver to such good that his power had become formidable. Je that power, they sought his destruction; or, i did not, the Red King did. Several fortres taken from Henry, and he was compelled to Mount St. Michael: a lofty rock "which stands the day in the midst of sand, and twice enco with tidal waters." Malmesbury relates two occ attending the siege of Mount St. Michael whi trate the different characters of Robert and W As Rufus was riding near the fortress he was u by a soldier, who was about to kill him, but o out that he was King of England, he was Robert was more generous and merciful than W Having learnt that Henry and the garris suffering from thirst, he contrived that they obtain water, at which William was enrage shame!" exclaimed Robert, "should I per brother to die of thirst, where should we find if we lose him?" In the end Henry capitula he was allowed to retire into Brittany.

William returned to England A.D. 1092. accompanied by the Duke of Normandy. Du absence, Malcolm, king of Scotland, had inva northern counties, and William hastened to dr back. The two kings met in Lothian, and was concluded. On his return, however, seized Carlisle, which was an appanage of th

CARLISLE CASTLE.

and, and the quarrel was renewed. Malcolm the restoration of Carlisle, and when it was he invaded Northumberland; but he and his ard were killed in a sudden surprise or by y. In this war William was assisted by his Robert; but the harmony between the two was not of long duration. For the possesich Robert had surrendered to William in ly, he had been promised an equivalent in England. It was chiefly to obtain this indemhe visited this country; but he came in vain: ned to Normandy without having his claim

Twelve barons on either side had witnessed act between Robert and William; but, notding, it remained, so far as William was d, a dead letter. On his return to the Con-Robert sent messenger after messenger to calling upon him to fulfil it; but he got

At length Robert sent two heralds to Engdenounce William as a perjured knight. f faithlessness as he was, William could not y imputation on his honour. In the spring 94 he went over to Normandy to submit the dispute to arbitration; but though twentyns decreed against him, he would not yield. ontrary, he resolved upon war rather than price of his possessions purchased in Nor-A large army was collected at Hastings; but was not undertaken, for it is recorded that the upon making a handsome contribution to the 's wants, were allowed to return home. Those tions appear to have been required to carry liam's system of bribery in Normandy; a ectual mode of securing his interests there the sword. While thus engaged, however, was recalled to England to put down an outthe Welsh. Taking advantage of his absence, overrun several English counties, and before d the scene of action, they had again returned . William pursued them into their mountain s, but he was compelled to retreat with great l when again, in A.D. 1095, he entered the ountains with a large army, he met with a eat. About the same time, however, he conspiracy in the north of England, which led by Mowbray, earl of Northumberland, h had for its object the raising of the red usin, Stephen, earl of Aumale, to the throne, ountry was restored to peace.

there was peace, the people were oppressed. the quarrels of these turbulent princes the tic greatly suffered; for the money spent by n bribing his brother Robert's Norman barons g from the people by grievous taxation. A tax 1091 was so severe that the capital required intenance of agriculture was absorbed, and t was famine and death. Malmesbury says e next year, "On account of the heavy tribute e king had levied while in Normandy, agriiled; of which failure the immediate conseas famine. This gaining ground, a mortality general that the dying wanted attendance, ead burial. In these same years London was two calamities. In the first it was visited nt whirlwind, which blew down six hundred houses; and in the second the greater part of it was destroyed by fire." It cannot be supposed that in the brief space of four years the people could have recovered from these heavy inflictions of tribute, famine, and disaster, and yet in the year 1096 there was an edict for an "intolerable tax throughout England." If there was peace, therefore, the people were oppressed.

This "intolerable tax" was imposed upon the people of England for a strange purpose. The rival brothers had come to a new arrangement: one which eventually led to the reunion of England with Normandy. Robert pawned his dukedom to William for five years for the sum of ten thousand pounds. This mortgage of Normandy was connected with one of the most marvellous movements of mankind recorded in history. At this time Peter of Amiens, known as Peter the Hermit, had proclaimed everywhere on the Continent that the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, which Christian pilgrims had freely visited from the days of Haroun Alraschid, had been closed against them by the Turks, who had conquered Syria; and that they were mercilessly massacred, plundered, and sold into slavery. His zeal in the cause of these pilgrims was unbounded. So eloquently did he set forth their sufferings that all Christendom armed to battle, to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel. Pope Urban took up the cause. In November, A.D. 1095, he attended a great council at Clermont, in Auvergne, and when from a lofty scaffold in the market-place, he exhorted the assembled thousands by whom he was surrounded to assume the cross —the badge of the crusaders—princes and nobles; knights and priests; burgesses and peasants, with one voice, as he closed his harangue, exclaimed that it was "the will of God." Men of all ranks assumed the cross, and among them was Robert of Normandy. Generous-hearted and brave, he eagerly joined the crusaders; and it was for this chivalrous enterprise that he mortgaged his dukedom, and that William plundered his subjects to pay the stipulated price for its surrendor; to raise which he even compelled the Church to deliver up its golden shrines and its silver chalices.

Robert departed for Palestine, where, at the head of his knights and horsemen, in the midst of privations unknown to Norman warriors, and exposed to diseases unfelt in his own pleasant land, he fought in battle and siege bravely. And William—what, in the meantime, was he doing? Like a grasping usurper he was in Normandy, foreclosing his mortgage. Crossing over the sea, he took possession of Normandy, and as long as he lived trampled it under foot. Yet his dukedom gave him some trouble. First, it involved him in the old quarrel with the King of France, and when this was settled by negotiation, he was called upon to quell an insurrection in Maine. Helie, lord of La Flèche, a gallant young soldier, aided by the people of Maine, surprised the town of Mans, and was besieging the castle; on hearing of which, William, who had then returned to England, hastened to the Continent to take vengeance. He landed at Touques, and was soon at the head of his troops, but Helie fled without offering battle. The Red King then laid waste the province of Maine. Its vines were uprooted; its

fruit-trees cut down; its towns and villages levelled to the ground; and the whole country ravaged with fire and sword. Being wounded, however, in laying siege to the castle of Maiet, he dismissed his forces and returned to England.

The lavish expenditure of William was ever on the increase. No sooner had he spent the proceeds of one heavy tribute levied upon his subjects than he wanted money for another. Like Robert, the Duke of Guienne assumed the cross, and in order to defray the expenses of his expedition he offered to mortgage *his* dominions to William. The Red King willingly accepted the offer; for his lust for territorial aggrandisement was unbounded. He began to raise the money, but this time he met with some opposition. In the year 1093 he had appointed Anselm to the archbishopric of Canterbury, which had long been vacant; but he had quarrelled with the primate, and had compelled him to go into exile, and hence the ecclesiastics were not now so well affected towards him as to afford him the aid he required willingly. His rapacity, indeed, had bred contempt in the minds of all classes of his subjects—churchmen, thanes, and people. Whether this contempt led to the final catastrophe, or whether it was the result of accident, cannot now be determined, but certain it is that he did not live to close his bargain with the Duke of Guienne.

In the month of August, A.D. 1100, William went with many lords and gentlemen to hunt in the New Forest. The old chroniclers relate that his dreams of the previous night, and the dreams of a monk, who saw him struck down by an image in a church, as he was insulting the symbol of religion, had foreshadowed his coming fate, and that for a time he was dispirited, and refused to join in the chase. After taking copious draughts of wine, however, he became brave: despite these ill-omened dreams, he went to hunt in the forest. Twice before, he knew that the blood of his race had been shed in that ill-fated domain; but that was no reason why he should perish there. So recently as the month of May, Richard, the illegitimate son of Duke Robert, had been killed by an arrow in the forest; but that was no reason why he should be so slain. But he did so perish, and he was so slain notwithstanding. His companions were all dispersed about the forest, and Walter Tyrrel alone was with him. The sun was then declining and William had drawn his bow, and had wounded a stag. The wound was not fatal, but the stag paused, not knowing which way to flee from his pursuers. It is related that William called aloud to Sir Walter to shoot, "in the devil's name;" but whether he did or not, Tyrrel did shoot. With the speed of lightning the arrow sped from his bow, and glancing from an intervening tree, it pierced William's left breast, which was exposed by the raising of his arm to shield his eyes from the glare of the sun's rays; and with no word or prayer uttered, he fell from his horse and expired. Tyrrel escaped to his native country, France; and late in the evening the dead body of the Red King was found by a charcoal-burner, who put it, still bleeding, in his cart, and conveyed it to Winchester, where it was buried under a tower of the Cathedral Church of St. Swithin.

Such is the generally received account of the death of the Red King. All that is certain, however, is *was* killed by an arrow in the New For whether by accident or design is not known writers have supposed that his brother H whom he had become reconciled, and who wa the party hunting in the forest, either drew t shaft himself, or suborned some one to com deed, that he might reign king over England others have conceived that he was shot down discontented subject who had heavy wr avenge. Another probable explanation is, th feast had preceded the hunt, and the wine been freely used, the whole party was intoxica that some unsteady hand drew the bow whi the arrow to his heart. The precise circum attending his death must remain a myste one thing is clear, that the character of Willia had become so odious, from his licentiousness, and rapacity, that he perished unlamented classes of his subject.

During the reigns of the two first Norma of England the civil and military history o is unmarked by any important event: it chie sisting of the successions of petty chieftains; mutual wars against each other; and their pr incursions into the English territories.

As before recorded, when William the Co landed in England, Malcolm III., surnamed C or "Great-head," was peaceably seated on the of Scotland. He commenced his reign A.D. 1(had at that period therefore reigned nine year principal events of the history of his reign, sub to the Conquest, chiefly arose out of his co with the unfortunate Edgar Atheling, the tr of the English crown. Edgar fled with his and two sisters to Scotland early in the year 1(soon after, Malcolm married Margaret his eld at Dunfermline. Malcolm gave a generous w to those of the English nobility who fled fr vengeance of the Conqueror during the severa in which he was engaged in reducing the En his sway. It was at the instigation of these refugees and in support of Edgar Atheling's that he made several inroads into the northern of England, which were retaliated by similar of the Conqueror and of the Red King into Sc a warfare which finally ended in his death as besieging the castle of Alnwick in Novembe As before seen, his eldest son Edward perish him: an event which so much affected his pi attached queen, Margaret, that she died, a fe after, of grief. From the time of Malcolm C Scotland may be said to have become a Saxon dom, for from that period its monarchs spo Saxon and not the Gaelic language. Besides E King Malcolm had five other sons: Edmun became a churchman; Ethelred, who died in fancy; and Edgar, Alexander, and David, wh successively kings of Scotland. He had al daughters: Matilda, who married Henry I. I England; and Mary, who was united to Eusta of Boulogne.

At the death of Malcolm, his sons being und the throne of Scotland was usurped by his b Donald Bane, or "the Fair." He is said to hav

raised to the throne by a faction which had, from the time of Malcolm's marriage with the Saxon queen, Margaret, been opposed to the English innovations. And those innovations were not of slight import. They had embraced not only names and language, but a variety of other particulars. There were changes, in his reign, in government and laws; in the forms of religious worship; in the titles of the nobility; in usages; and in manners and customs. While, indeed, the Conquest made Saxon England Norman, it made to some extent Celtic Scotland Saxon. Such changes as these were no doubt distasteful to the Celtic population of Scotland, and hence, when Donald appeared from the western islands, where he had taken refuge on the death of his father Duncan half a century before, he found an easy path to the Scottish throne. Still, Donald does not appear to have felt that he was secure in his usurpation, for he sought support from Magnus, King of Norway, ceding to him the western islands as the price of that support. But this measure, combined with severities in his government, contributed to his dethronement. It created many malcontents, and on their invitation, Duncan, a natural son of Malcolm Canmore, in the service of the Red King, at the head of some English troops entered Scotland; and being joined by the friends of Malcolm's family, Donald, six months after his accession, found himself compelled to retire once more to the western islands. Duncan was crowned King of Scotland, but his reign was brief. As he had before his invasion of Scotland sworn fealty to the Red King, and as he delighted more in the company of the English and Normans than in the Scots, he became unpopular. He became king in May, 1094, but towards the close of the next year, at the instigation of Donald Bane, he was assassinated by Malpedir Earl of Mearns, in the castle of Monteith. Donald again became king, and after his restoration he pursued his former course of policy —that of the expulsion of foreign settlers and the abolition of all English innovations—with renewed vigour. But he did not long enjoy this second usurpation. The Red King of England, having furnished Edgar Atheling with troops, marched into Scotland, and after an obstinate contest overcame Donald and seated his nephew, prince Edgar, on the throne of his ancestors. It would appear that both Duncan and Edgar swore fealty to William Rufus for the kingdom of Scotland, but this was not from any right that the Norman king had to bestow that kingdom on either, but only from an assumption of that right, which arose from the simple circumstance that without his aid the usurpation of Donald could not have been set aside. Yet it was from these and similar slender pretensions that the English monarchs eventually laid claim to Scotland as an integral portion of their dominions.

SECTION III.

HENRY I., SURNAMED BEAUCLERK.

William Rufus was never married, and had, therefore, no legitimate children to quarrel about his crown. Two brothers, however, were left to dispute the succession. Henry was on the spot, but Robert was still in Palestine. All the chances, therefore, were in Henry's favour. But he had a chase for the crown. He had been riding near the spot where the Red King fell, but instead of repairing to the bleeding corpse, as a brother should have done, he spurred his horse along the green glades of the forest towards Winchester to seize the royal treasury. He rode twenty miles on that sultry autumn evening: all eager for his prey. But he was not the only horseman whose face was turned towards Winchester on that eventful evening. Divining his purpose, William de Breteuil, the treasurer of Rufus, followed hard after him to prevent his laying hands on his deceased brother's treasures. They arrived at Winchester in the same hour. Henry was already demanding the keys of the royal treasury when William de Breteuil appeared. Henry's demand was opposed. The faithful treasurer insisted that the keys should not be given up, on the ground that Prince Henry as well as himself had paid homage to the elder brother Robert as the rightful successor to the throne. Henry attempted to shake De Breteuil's fidelity by argument, and this failing he had recourse to violence. Drawing his sword, he threatened death to any one who opposed him. What could William de Breteuil do? Some barons present and the late king's domestics took part with Henry, and the vault of the castle in which the Red King's treasures were deposited was thrown open, and Henry obtained possession of them. The rest was easy. He had now money to lavish away to obtain the crown, and he obtained it. Three days after the death of Rufus, he was crowned at Westminster: Maurice, bishop of London, performing the ceremony.

At his coronation Henry promised before God and all the people to annul all the unrighteous acts his brother had committed. He commenced his reign wisely. His government was quickly purged of the evil ministers of his brother's pleasures, and the corrupt administrators of his oppressive exactions. Ralph Flambard, who had been created bishop of Durham, was committed to the Tower, but he subsequently contrived to escape from his imprisonment and to pass over into Normandy. From the commencement of his reign Henry appears to have been desirous of propitiating the English. It is probable that he was as much Norman in heart as his father and brother, but he knew that the support of the English was necessary for the security of his throne. His reign, indeed, was the commencement of the re-establishment of English independence, and the overthrow of Norman domination. By a royal charter he revived the laws of Edward the Confessor: annulling those enacted by his Norman predecessors. All this had a tendency to make him popular among his English subjects, but his choice of a queen was the crowning act which gained him their full support. He married Maud, daughter of Malcolm, King of Scotland, and of Matilda, sister of Edwin Atheling. Maud had been brought up after the death of the "good queen," Matilda, her mother, under the care of her aunt, the abbess of Wilton, who, to preserve her from the importunities of the Norman warriors, had caused her to take the veil, although she had not taken the vows of celibacy. Even the ecclesiastics of the period, after solemn deliberation, held that Maud was at liberty to

marry, and though she was at first averse to being united with one of that race who had conquered Saxon England she finally consented. Henry, attracted "by her graces and virtues," shared the throne with her. She was crowned by Gerard, bishop of Hereford, and the marriage was called "The union of races."

This union effectually engaged the hearts of the native English, but at the same time it gave deep offence to the imperious Norman nobles. They had sternly opposed the marriage, and when it took place they showed their resentment in bitter railleries. But Henry was supported by the best of the churchmen, and especially by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom he had wisely recalled from exile; and though he was stung to the quick by the jibes of the Norman barons, he dissembled his rage till the time came when he could safely take his revenge. That time was yet distant.

On his accession to the throne, Henry had caused a report to be circulated abroad that his brother Robert had been created King of Jerusalem, and that he would never return from Palestine. Robert had greatly distinguished himself in the "holy war" in which he had engaged, performing prodigies of valour in the field and in the siege and capture of Jerusalem, but he had *not* been elected sovereign by the crusaders. A King of Jerusalem had been created by them, but the dignity had been conferred upon Godfrey de Bouillon, a man "born for command." The crusaders do not appear to have ever contemplated raising the Duke of Normandy to that throne, nor did Robert aspire to it: he had aided in rescuing the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel Turk, and

CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

having effected his object, his generous heart was satisfied. He had, indeed, left Palestine immediately after the capture of Jerusalem, which occurred in July, A.D. 1099; and, for more than a year before the death of his brother, the Red King, he had been enjoying himself in sunny Italy. Before the conquest of England, the Normans had possessed themselves of the fairest portion of Southern Italy, and on his return thither from the Holy Land, Robert was everywhere welcomed at the baronial castles of his kindred. At one of these castles he found a wife, for he married Sibylla, the daughter of William, Count of Conversano, the most powerful lord in Lower Apulia, with whom he obtained a large sum of money as her dowry. He was in Lower Apulia when the throne of England was, "by the mercy of God and the common consent of the barons of the kingdom," bestowed upon Henry; soon after which event Robert and his bride came to Normandy.

Robert was joyfully received by all his Norman subjects: all the country, except the fortresses which he had surrendered to Rufus, and which were now kept for Henry, fell into his hands. Encouraged by his Norman barons, Robert soon declared his intention of claiming the English crown. He was led to believe that the Normans in England were all-powerful; that he had only to cross the channel and to conquer. But this was far from the truth. Some of the Norman barons in England — among whom were Robert de Belesme, Earl of Shrewsbury and Arundel, and his two brothers, Roger and Arnulf, William de Warrenne, Walter Giffard, Yvo de Grentmesnil, Robert de Pontefract, and Robert de Mallet—were ready to take up arms in Duke Robert's favour, but there were others who remained faithful to King Henry. But Henry did not depend upon the Norman population in England. Wisely distrusting *them*, he threw himself upon the support of his English subjects. They were, he said, his friends, his vassals, his *countrymen*; the best and bravest of men, although his brother *did* call them gluttons and cowards. Among the churchmen Henry found most zealous supporters: Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, taking a prominent part in his favour. Anselm's support may in part have been given on the promise of large concessions to the Pope and the Church, but it appears to have been chiefly afforded from an honest conviction that the liberties of the people would be better secured under the rule of Henry than they would be under that of Robert. Hence it was that Anselm aided Henry in making preparations to meet the common danger with the utmost zeal. He even became surety for Henry to the barons of his party that he would never break any of his promises, or revoke any of the liberties he had granted; and this, combined with his denunciations against any who might revolt, kept them steady in their attachment.

Robert was in no hurry to invade England. Instead of making preparations, he lost much time in feastings and pageantries. Although brave, he was fonder of pleasure than war. At length, however, at the earnest entreaties of Ralph Flambard, he bestirred himself for the enterprise. It was in the summer of A.D. 1101 that Robert set sail for England. Henry had fitted out a fleet to cruise on the coast of Normandy, to oppose the passage of the Normans, but the English sailors proved faithless. Partly from the admiration of Robert's fame, but more from Ralph Flambard's intrigues, a great part of Henry's fleet deserted his cause. It was in these very ships that Robert and his forces sailed to Portsmouth, where they landed. But what was the result of all this show of battle? The two armies confronted each other, and that was all. The English remained faithful to Henry, but the

Normans wavered in their zeal for Robert. Robert himself does not appear to have been in earnest, or if he was he soon relented. His heart had not been hardened by bloodshed, nor was he in heart an unkind brother. In the heat of passion, when insulted by William and Henry, he had threatened to wipe out the insult by the shedding of their blood, but yet we have seen that his anger was not lasting; that he had again and again been reconciled to them, although they had ill repaid his generous conduct. And even now, when the Crown of England—the prize he had so long desired and waited for—had been unjustly taken from him, he was still the same generous-hearted brother. Henry knew his character well, and he desired a conference with him, which was readily conceded. They met in the presence of the hostile troops, who formed a circle around them — both Normans and English being under arms — and the war was over before it had in reality commenced. There was a reconciliation between Robert and Henry. A treaty was concluded without umpires. Robert relinquished his pretensions to the crown of England for an annual pension of three thousand marks, and the restoration of all the castles which Henry held in Normandy, and the sword rested in the scabbard. At the same time it was stipulated that if either of the brothers died without legitimate issue, the other should succeed to all his dominions; and all the barons of both parties were to be restored to their estates and honours in Normandy and England. This pacification was followed by the disbandment of both armies; and Robert, having spent about two months with Henry in great festivity, he returned to his duke-dom in Normandy.

That part of this remarkable treaty which sets forth that the adherents on either side should be restored to their estates and honours was scrupulously observed by Robert, but not by Henry. In the year 1102 he commenced a series of persecutions against those who had favoured his brother's enterprise. He began with Robert de Belesme, Earl of Shrewsbury and Arundel, who was one of the most powerful of all the Norman chieftains; having strong castles at Arundel, Blythe, Bridgenorth, and Shrewsbury. De

ABBEY CHURCH, SHREWSBURY.

Belesme had many charges preferred against him, and he was summoned to take his trial; and when he refused to appear, Henry called out his military force to subdue that proud and powerful baron; and within three weeks his castles were taken, and the earl retired into Normandy. All England rejoiced at the downfall of this powerful Norman baron, and from that time, during the thirty-three years of Henry's subsequent reign, the realm of Albion enjoyed peace and tranquillity, no one daring to revolt or hold a fortress against the king. The power of the Norman barons in England became a thing of the past. One by one, nearly all of them—the descendants of those who had achieved the conquest of England — were driven out of the land as traitors and outlaws, and their estates and their honours repassed into the hands of the English: not the posterity of their ancient possessors, but "new men" who had rendered good service to Henry in the time of danger.

The severities exercised upon the Norman barons excited the pity of the generous-hearted Robert. He did not take up arms in their favour, but he did that which was equally distasteful to King Henry—he came over in a spirit of generosity to plead their cause. He was received with smiles and brotherly embraces, but he soon found that he was more a prisoner than a guest. Spies watched his every movement, and he could only recover his liberty by renouncing his annuity of three thousand marks. Thus again wronged, on his return to Normandy he renewed his friendship with the exiled Norman barons as an act of self-defence. Many of these entered his service: the most powerful being De Belesme, who owned thirty castles in Normandy. Henry now declared that there was no longer peace between him and his brother. Yet Robert had neither the intention nor the power of making war upon Henry. In the year 1102 he had lost his wife Sibylla, and from that time his court became a scene of profligacy. Through his indolence, imprudence, and profligacy, he lost all authority. While, indeed, he was surrounded with jugglers, loose women, and rapacious courtiers, his barons waged war and inflicted all kinds of wrongs and insults on his people. Some of the Norman barons invited Henry to Normandy to put an end to these confusions and to restore the peace of the country. Invitation, however, was superfluous, for Henry had made up his mind to deprive Robert of his duchy. He called upon him to cede it for a given sum of money paid down at once, or an annual pension, and when this was refused, in the year 1105, he crossed the seas with a large army to obtain possession of it: by bribery, if possible; if not, by force of arms. Many of the fortresses of Normandy *were* obtained by bribery, but notwithstanding Robert's delinquencies, many powerful barons still adhered to his cause. He had nothing to give them, for he had spent or been robbed of all his wealth; but still they remained faithful, partly from their animosity to Henry, and partly from their desire to profit by Robert's maladministration. Henry found that he could not complete his brother's ruin in that campaign, and he returned to England for more men and money. These obtained, he returned to Normandy A.D. 1106. The money Henry obtained was wrung from his English subjects; for like the Red King he had re

course to heavy exactions to further the ends of his ambition. At this time, indeed, the charter he had granted to his English subjects had become a dead letter; and all the promises made at his coronation were either broken utterly or ill fulfilled. It was July when Henry arrived in Normandy, and he immediately invested the castle of Tenchebray. It was vigorously defended by the garrison, and Robert came to its assistance with a large force of Norman chivalry. De Belesme and other Norman barons had raised a considerable army to contest the victory with King Henry. The decisive battle was fought on the 28th of September, which, by a singular coincidence, was the anniversary of William the Conqueror's landing at Hastings. Robert had shaken off his indolence, for brave as when he fought in Palestine he fell upon the king's army with the vigour for which he had then been renowned: he had nearly won the victory, but there was treachery in his camp. De Belesme had evidently been tampered with, for on the eve of victory he fled, and his flight was followed by Robert's defeat. After bravely fighting against superior numbers, the gallant duke was taken prisoner with four hundred of his knights, and Normandy was subdued to England.

The fate of the prisoners taken *at*, or who surrendered *after*, the battle of Tenchebray differed; some being pardoned and even rewarded, while others were ransomed, and others imprisoned. De Belesme, whom Henry had driven out of England, as a reward for his treachery at that battle, had a new grant of most of his estates in Normandy, while Ralph Flambard, for his delivering up the town and castle of Lisieux, was restored to his English see of Durham. Edgar Atheling, who was in Normandy at the time as a guest of Robert's, and who fought in the battle of Tenchebray, was sent over to England, where he lived and died in obscurity on a trifling pension allowed him by Henry. The severest fate was reserved for Robert: that generous-hearted brother, who, when Henry was besieged in Mount St. Michael, contrived, against the Red King's will, to let him have water that he might not die of thirst, was sent as a prisoner to Cardiff Castle, where he was immured to the day of his death, which occurred A.D. 1135. How he was treated during his long imprisonment is uncertain. When Pope Calixtus exhorted Henry, in the year 1117, to release him, he was informed that he was not bound in fetters like a captive enemy, but treated like a noble pilgrim worn by long sufferings. It was represented that he was placed in a royal castle, and had a table and wardrobe supplied with all kinds of luxuries. The luxuries are doubtful, but he appears to have been well supplied with food and clothing, and Malmesbury adds that he had also an abundance of amusement. But if what other chroniclers relate is true—that his eyes were blinded by the organs of sight being seared by a red-hot basin passed over them—amusements would have been a mockery. This story, however, rests upon no contemporary authority, and all that is certain is that Robert spent the remainder of his days in solitude, under the guardianship of stern keepers, and that he outlived all his companions in the crusades; dying only a few months before his relentless brother Henry.

According to monkish historians, in the midst of all his greatness and prosperity Henry was not happy; that he was tormented with remorse for his cruel treatment of his brother. Instead, however, of seeking ease for his conscience in the only way in which it could have been obtained—namely, by making reparation to the injured one, he adopted the usual mode existing in that age to remove remorse, that of building abbeys and making large donations to the church. That was a grand doctrine in the Romish church, for it was held that it was the only effectual way of obtaining peace of conscience. But Henry appears to have been not so much uneasy about the imprisonment of his brother as he was about the liberty of the infant son of Robert. At the time of the battle of Tenchebray that young prince, the offspring of Robert and the beautiful Sibylla, was five years old. He had been brought up at Falaise, and when Henry took possession of that place he fell into his hands. It is recorded that young William wept and cried for mercy when brought into his uncle's presence, and that there was a struggle in Henry's mind as to how his young nephew should be treated. He could not but foresee that one day the legitimate claims of that boy of five years old might cause him trouble. He must at all events be given into safe custody. He was committed to the care of Helie de St. Saen, a Norman baron in Henry's interest, but the guardian proved to be honest in the protection of the young prince. Having repented of his arrangement, Henry sent a body of horse to surprise the castle of St. Saen to secure the young prince, but Helie fled with his pupil, and placed him under the protection of Louis, king of France, and Fulke, earl of Anjou. For a time, Louis and Fulke were staunch protectors of William Fitz-Robert: Louis engaged to grant him the investiture of Normandy, and Fulke promised, when he was of age, to give him his daughter Sibylla in marriage. Their patronage of the young prince, however, was not from any disinterested motive. The power of Henry on the continent was a source of anxiety to them, and they hoped by their support of William FitzRobert to diminish that power. In the year 1113, therefore, Henry was attacked by Louis and Fulke, assisted by the Earl of Flanders, along the whole frontier of Normandy. Many of his towns and castles were captured; but Henry proved more than a match for the confederates. He hastened to the continent to protect his Norman dominions, and there was war for two years; but peace was brought about more by skilful diplomacy than by the sword. In the end, Henry regained all he lost by treaty; a treaty in which the interest of William FitzRobert was entirely overlooked. Henry agreed to give the Earl of Anjou all the estates of the faithful Helie de St. Saen which he had confiscated, and that his son William should marry Matilda, one of the earl's daughters; and then the contract between William and Sibylla was unceremoniously broken, on the plea of consanguinity, and Helie with his pupil fled for refuge to the court of Baldwin, earl of Flanders.

Having thus dissipated the storm that threatened him in his foreign dominions, Henry returned to England, and with the exception of some disturbances caused by the incursions of the Welsh, which were

easily quelled, he spent several years in great tranquillity. Still his mind was full of anxious thought. His one absorbing desire at this period was to secure the succession of all his dominions to his son, Prince William. While in Normandy he had made all the barons and prelates swear fealty and do homage to the boy prince, and on his return to England, A.D. 1115, he exacted the same oaths of all the barons and prelates of England. These oaths were taken in a great council held at Salisbury, but the performance of them was never required. Death visits palaces. In the year 1118, Henry lost his good queen Maud, "who had sacrificed herself for her race in vain;" and, as will be seen, he soon after lost his son, Prince William, for whose dominion, when he himself should be laid in the cold tomb, he intrigued and fought.

Henry was in Normandy when Queen Maud died, having gone thither in the year 1116. He spent four years on the continent; chiefly, it would appear, from the growing popularity of William FitzRobert, whose existence was a torment to his mind. If he could have got him into his power, how happy he would have been! He had invited him to England, and held out to him the glittering bait of three earldoms if he would become his guest, but FitzRobert was not to be enticed into the hands of his father's gaoler. Henry's want of good faith was proverbial. It was the want of that faith which, in A.D. 1118, endangered the stability of his dominion. He had secretly assisted his nephew Theobald, earl of Blois, in a revolt against his liege lord the French king; had broken off the match between his son William and Matilda of Anjou, and had broken many promises made in his hour of need to several of the Norman barons. All these, with Baldwin, earl of Flanders, confederated against him. The disaffection of the Norman nobles was so general that he knew not whom to trust. Even Eustace, earl of Breteuil, who had married Henry's natural daughter Juliana, joined the confederates. And he was not only surrounded by open enemies, but by secret traitors. It is related that Juliana discharged an arrow from a cross-bow at her father's breast. In the midst of all these dangers, however, Henry did not lose his courage or presence of mind. He is said to have slept in armour, with his sword and shield by his side; a guard of faithful servants keeping ward and watch in his apartment. At the commencement of the war, Henry acted on the defensive, waiting for favourable events, and endeavouring to divide the confederates by his old system of intrigue. He suffered many reverses, but his star again rose in the ascendant. At the siege of Eu, Baldwin, earl of Flanders, who joined the league out of affection for the gallant William FitzRobert, received a mortal wound of which he soon after died. That was a great loss to the confederates, for Baldwin was the most skilful of all its leaders. *He* was lost in open battle; Fulke of Anjou was next lost to them by bribery. Henry sent a large sum of money to that venal earl, and a message that the marriage between his son William and Matilda of Anjou should be solemnized forthwith; and he withdrew his troops, and the marriage took place in June, A.D. 1119. Many of the Norman barons were next tampered with. Rich presents and profuse promises detached them from the confederacy, and the French king found himself nearly deserted by all his allies. The contest now having become more equal, Henry took the field in earnest. Hitherto the contest had been characterized by petty sieges and skirmishes: it was henceforth to be real battle. In August, the French were marching to the capture of the town of Noyon, or Brenneville, a place on the road from Rouen to Paris. Henry marched against them. He had with him five hundred knights all clad in armour, and when near Noyon he met the French monarch with four hundred knights, clad in the same array. As they met, their vizors were lowered, the trumpets sounded, and their lances were couched. The French cavalry, led by William FitzRobert, made a brilliant charge. Henry's first rank was broken, and the Count of Evreux, a valiant knight, encountered King Henry, giving him two strokes on the head, but to no purpose: his steel helmet being sword-proof. The contest was soon over: the French fled, leaving the royal standard and many knights in the hands of the victors. William FitzRobert, now called William of Normandy, was unhorsed, but he made his escape. The French monarch fled to Andelay, conducted thither by a peasant who found him lost in the wood. The battle was more famous for the quality of the combatants—kings, princes, and many nobles being engaged in it—than for the slaughter. It did not take long to count the dead, for only three knights were slain. After the battle there was a display of chivalrous courtesies. The French king and William of Normandy both lost their horses, and while Henry sent Louis a war-horse richly caparisoned, his son William sent his cousin some handsome presents. Such was the famous battle of the French and English knights at Brenneville; it was the last of the war, for soon after, through the mediation of Pope Calixtus II., the French and English monarchs entered into a treaty of peace, by which Henry was to remain in undisturbed possession of Normandy: Prince William, to save the pride of his father, doing homage to Louis for the duchy.

Henry returned to England in triumph, but he did not long enjoy its fruits. It was on the 25th of November, A.D. 1120, that he embarked at Barfleur. His retinue was very numerous, and some delay occurred in the providing accommodation and means of transport for it. At length all was ready, and the sails were unfurled for the voyage. Previous to sailing, one Thomas Fitzstephen, a mariner, presented himself to Henry, representing that he was the son of Airard, who had conveyed the Conqueror to England to make war on Harold, and begging that he might have the honour of conveying him, the king, thither in his ship, the Blanche Nef. Henry replied that he had chosen his ship, but he would confide his son and his retinue, which consisted of the young nobility, to his care. Henry put to sea and reached England in safety, but not so did Prince William. He was in no haste; while Henry was gliding over the Channel he stopped to regale the mariners with wine, and to feast and dance with his company on the deck of the Blanche Nef. It was night when the Blanche Nef or White Ship set sail, but Thomas Fitzstephen promised to overtake the rest. All his sails were crowded, and while he stood proudly at the helm, fifty sturdy

mariners plied the oars with vigour. On they sped towards England. Both steersman and rowers were mad with the fumes of the wine given them by Prince William, and never dreamed of danger. As they proceeded coastwise, however, they got among the rocks at a spot called Ras de Cotte—now Ras de Cotteville—and the Blanche Nef struck upon one of them, filled, and went down to the bottom of the sea. It is related that William and some of the leading nobles were, when the ship struck, put into a boat let down for their rescue, and that they might have reached the shore in safety, but the Prince hearing the shrieks of his natural sister, the Countess of Perche, commanded the boat to put back and take her in, when such numbers leaped into it that it was swamped, and all perished. Of the three hundred persons on board the Blanche Nef, one man only—Berold, a butcher of Rouen—was saved to tell the tale.

Thus perished Prince William, the heir to all his father's greatness; and in whose favour he had formed so many ambitious designs, and had been guilty of so much wrong. The tidings reached England on the following day, but no one ventured to tell them to the king. For three whole days his courtiers concealed the fate of the unfortunate prince. He was in the deepest anxiety: often inquiring if the Blanche Nef had reached his kingdom, but no one dared to tell him of the catastrophe. At length, however, by a concerted plan, a little boy, weeping bitterly, fell at his feet, and revealed the tidings. Henry was not a tender-hearted monarch, but his heart was not insensible to such a shock. It was stricken to its inmost core, and he fell down in a swoon. The blow told upon him for life; for, though he lived several years, it is recorded that he sank into such a state of gloomy dejection that he was never afterwards seen to smile. But if Henry grieved for the loss of his son, the people of England did not, as a nation, share in his grief. Born though he was of a gentle and tender Saxon mother, he was a fierce Norman in disposition. He had been heard to threaten that when he became king he would treat the English as beasts of burden, and hence his death was generally considered to have been a merciful interposition of Providence. "He was thinking," writes Henry of Huntingdon, "of his future reign and greatness, but God said, It shall not be thus, thou impious: it shall not be. And so it fell out that his brow, instead of being girded with a crown of gold, was beaten against the rocks of the ocean."

Deep as Henry's grief is said to have been, he soon indulged again in his habitual ambition. In the hope of having an heir to his throne, in January, A.D. 1121, he was married at Windsor to Adelais, the daughter of the Duke of Louvain, and niece to Pope Calixtus. Adelais was young and beautiful, but the marriage proved unfruitful, and after three or four years had passed away he formed the design of settling the crown on his legitimate daughter Matilda. She had been married to the Emperor of Germany, and had, A.D. 1124, become a widow. Two years after, at the festival of Christmas, in a solemn assembly at Windsor, of prelates, nobles and the great tenants of the Crown, the ex-empress of Germany was declared, in the event of there being no male issue, to be the next heir to the throne of England. A female sovereign was unknown both in England and on the continen disgust and astonishment were secretly express such an announcement. But Henry was abs none dared openly to oppose his proceedings. clergy took the lead and the laity followed; both c swore to maintain Matilda's succession. Amongst who took the oath was Stephen, earl of Boulogn of Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror; R earl of Gloucester, the illegitimate son of Henry David, king of Scotland, Matilda's uncle, who the oath as an English earl. That he might e her succession to Normandy as well as Eng in the year 1127 Henry concluded her mar with Geoffrey, surnamed Plantagenet, the so

GEOFFREY PLANTAGENET.

Fulke, earl of Anjou, then at the head of that powerful house on the continent. Fulke himself renounced the government of Anjou, and had go Palestine as a crusader, where he had been cr King of Jerusalem. There were deep murmurs, among the English and Norman barons, concer this union, but Henry willed it: Geoffrey and Ma were married at Rouen, and proclamation was i that every one was to make merry, and that who did not join in the diversions and games provide their amusement in honour of the wedding, shoul held guilty of an offence towards "his lord king."

Meanwhile Henry had much to do to retain Norman possessions. The death of his son brightened the prospects of his nephew, William I Robert. Previous to the settlement of the Cr of England on Matilda, there had been a widesp movement in his favour on the continent. Fu Earl of Anjou, had again promised him his daug Sibylla in marriage: Louis of France once n

favoured him; and the Norman barons rallied around his cause. Henry, however, had spies everywhere. He discovered the conspiracy that was forming against him, and having appointed Roger, bishop of Salisbury, regent of the kingdom, he sailed from Portsmouth about Whitsuntide, A.D. 1123, with a considerable army to crush it. Falling upon the conspirators before their plot was ripe for execution, the revolt was quickly subdued. Some of the Norman barons were taken prisoners; and Fulke, earl of Anjou, then once more abandoned his intended son-in-law; readily consenting to the dissolution of his daughter's engagement with William FitzRobert, who therefore, though the union had been twice contracted, were never married. This was previous to the settlement of the crown on Matilda. After that, Henry sedulously sought the ruin of Prince William, both by craft and power. Louis, king of France, had not, like the venal earl of Anjou, abandoned his interests; on the contrary, when he again fled to the court of France for refuge, he gave him his queen's sister in marriage, and with her, as a portion, the countries of Pontoise, Chaumont, and Vexin, on the borders of Normandy; and when subsequently Charles the Good, successor to Baldwin, earl of Flanders, was murdered by his subjects, he conferred that earldom on FitzRobert. Louis had marched an army into Flanders to punish the murderers of Charles the Good, and while he remained in that country the people offered no opposition to their new earl, but no sooner had he departed than they broke out into open revolt. Thierry, landgrave of Alsace, placed himself at the head of the insurgents, and it seems probable that Henry stirred him up to lay claim to the earldom of Flanders in order to overthrow the rule of his nephew. If he did not do this, it is certain that he sent Thierry money, and promised to support him with all his might. The earldom of Flanders was claimed by Thierry on the ground of his descent from an ancient chief of that country. Lisle, Ghent, and other important places declared for him, but some of the people of Flanders adhered to the cause of their new earl, Prince William. A battle was fought under the walls of Alost, and Thierry was defeated, but in the moment of victory William received a wound in the hand, which resulted in mortification, and he died in July, A.D. 1128, in the monastery of St. Omer. In his last moments he wrote to his unnatural uncle, imploring mercy for his faithful guardian, Helie de St. Saen, and other Norman barons who had followed his fortunes, and Henry granted his petition. He was only too glad to comply with the dying requests of one who, had he lived, might have subverted all his deep-laid plans of ambition for the succession of his daughter Matilda.

That succession was now deemed secure by King Henry. And yet he must have felt that if she ever ascended the throne of England she would never reign in peace. Her union with Geoffrey of Anjou was a source of continual vexation of soul to himself; how much more then would it have been a source of disquiet to her subjects? Their marriage had been one of policy, and not of affection; hence there were continual quarrels with the ill-assorted pair. Geoffrey was ambitious, and Matilda was imperious. Henry was continually called upon to interfere between his daughter and son-in-law. On one occasion Matilda left her husband and came to England; then there was a patched-up reconciliation through Henry's mediation, and she returned to Anjou. In the year 1133, Matilda bore a son, and transported with joy at this event, Henry spent his Easter with great festivity at Oxford. At Oxford Henry called upon the barons of England and Normandy once more to swear fealty to his daughter Matilda. Nor to her alone. They were required to recognize as his successors her infant son, Henry, and the rest of her progeny yet unborn. Nothing loth to take oaths which they never meant to keep, the barons complied, and soon after Henry set sail for Normandy, from whence he never returned. Matilda gave birth to two more princes—Geoffrey and William—but the quarrels of husband and wife still continued. It was Henry's invariable rule to take part with his daughter, which finally resulted in an irreparable breach between him and his son-in-law; there was deep enmity between them to the day of Henry's death.

That event took place A.D. 1135. In that year an incursion of the Welsh demanded his presence in England, and he prepared for his journey; but in order to divert his grief, one day in November he "went abroad to hunt." His favourite hunting-seat was the Castle of Lions, about six leagues from Rouen. It was his last day's sport. In the evening he feasted upon a dish of lampreys, and the lampreys brought on indigestion, which was followed by fever, of which he died on the first of December. His body was brought to England and was interred in Reading Abbey; one of those he had erected to obtain peace of conscience for crimes committed.

Henry I. was an able but unprincipled ruler. He was the greatest general and the most consummate politician of the age in which he lived. The old chroniclers record that his education was remarkable, and that his natural abilities were excellent. It is for his acquaintance with philosophy and literature that he obtained the surname of Beauclerc or "The Scholar." But his private character dimmed the lustre of his public life. In him were united the most odious vices—ambition, cruelty, treachery, revenge, and licentiousness. Indeed, whatever good qualities he may have possessed, there can be no question that they were greatly overbalanced by his vices. Credit may be given him for the enforcement of respect for the laws and the tranquillity which existed during his reign in England; but this respect for the laws and this tranquillity were obtained by rigour rather than strict justice and good government. He was called the Lion of Justice, but there does not appear to have been any discrimination between the guilty and the innocent at the grand assizes. It is recorded that on one occasion there were eighty-four persons executed and six deprived of sight for theft, at an assize held at Huncote in Leicestershire: surely they were not all guilty; and if they were, the punishment awarded greatly exceeded the offence. On all occasions Henry's severity was extreme: his justice was never tempered with mercy. Fond as he is represented to have been of men of letters, his severity extended to them if they gave him even slight offence. Luke de Barre, a Norman knight and a

celebrated poet of the time, who fought against him on the continent, was taken prisoner and barbarously sentenced to lose his eyes; not, according to Henry's own plea for his severity, because De Barre had fought against him in the field, but for a deeper offence in his estimation—for holding him up to ridicule in poetical satire! The cruel sentence was executed, and De Barre bursting from the hands of his executioners dashed his brains out against a wall from excessive agony. And Henry's dissimulation was equal to his malignity: to be praised by him was a sure sign of coming ruin. Thus, on one occasion, he spoke in terms of the warmest praise of Bloet, bishop of Lincoln; and yet, very soon after, the bishop was ruined for having innocently said that the abbey which he was building at Eynsham should be as fine an erection as that which his sovereign had built at Reading. If, by word or deed, offence was given, friend and foe alike shared his vengance. Generally speaking, however, the crimes he committed during his reign had for their object the securing of his throne to his family. How many were sacrificed at the shrine of his ambition history has not fully recorded. And yet, after all, the ends of his ambition were defeated. He was only building castles in the air. Death robbed him of a son on whom his hopes had been founded, and a favourite set aside the succession of his daughter the ex-empress Matilda.

SECTION IV

STEPHEN.

When Henry was from time to time exacting oaths of his English and Norman barons that they would secure the succession of his daughter Matilda, he must have known that those oaths would never be observed. At that period Saxon England would have scorned to own the sway of a female sovereign; and as for the Normans, they would have felt themselves disgraced in holding their fiefs "under a distaff." The chief business of the Norman nobles was war, and they required a chief who was able to lead them out to battle. Civilization was not sufficiently advanced to admit of a female reign either in England or Normandy. Hence the accession of the ex-empress Matilda was exposed to a serious difficulty. True the English and Norman prelates and barons had repeatedly taken oaths before God and man that they would secure her succession; but it was under compulsion, and from the time they were taken they never meant to raise her to the throne. Who then was to reign over the people? Her rule was universally repudiated, and the tender years of her children which would require a lengthened regency, formed an obstacle in *their* way to the throne of England. Time had been when a natural son might have been elected to the crown, but society appears to have advanced so far in civilization as to have rendered illegitimacy a disqualification. If this had not been the case, Robert, earl of Gloucester, a natural son of the deceased monarch, would have laid claim to the vacant throne, but he neither aspired to it himself, nor was he urged to become a candidate for it by the prelates and barons who alone could have seated him thereon. Who then was to reign over the people? Little did Henry think that the very first who swore fealty to Matilda in the general assembly at Windsor would mount his throne and supplant his daughter. Yet, so it was! Stephen, earl of Boulogne, Henry's nephew by Adela the daughter of the Conqueror, became king of England.

To no one had King Henry been more bountiful than to his nephew Stephen. To his munificence Stephen was indebted for all his wealth and power. He belonged to no very opulent family, for his father Stephen, earl of Blois, did not stand in the first rank of nobles on the continent. Henry, however, ennobled his favourite nephew. He gave him the earldom of Montaigne in Normandy; he bestowed on him the forfeited estate of Robert Mallet, in this kingdom; and finally procured him a wife in the person of the princess Matilda, the only child of Mary, queen of Scotland, one of the old Saxon stock, and of Eustace earl of Boulogne, in whose right he enjoyed that earldom, and all the extensive estates of that family in England. If lavished favours could have secured fidelity to Henry and his posterity, those bestowed on Stephen, earl of Boulogne were all-sufficient; but it was an age when ambition set aside all considerations of fidelity and even common gratitude. While Henry was bestowing his princely bounties on his nephew, and while Stephen was professing himself to be a zealous and devoted partizan of Matilda, his ambition led him to look forward to the day when he should successfully usurp the throne of England.

Stephen was no stranger in the country he aspired to govern. He had lived much in England, and from his complacency of manners and readiness to joke, and "sit and regale even with low people," he had become a universal favourite; especially in the then rising city of London. He was with his uncle in his dying moments, but before the royal corpse had been borne by the nobles from the castle of Lions to Rouen, he was on his way to England. His passage across the channel was a stormy one; and he landed during a winter storm of thunder and lightning. The gates of Dover and Canterbury were closed against him, but he was received in London with enthusiasm: the citizens saluted him as their king. No doubt there had been a previous understanding between Stephen and some, at least, of the prelates and barons, that on Henry's decease he should succeed to the throne, for these proceedings could not have been the result of a sudden impulse. His first step was to obtain the gold and the crown jewels in the royal treasury at Winchester. This was easy. His own brother Henry was Bishop of Winchester, and by his assistance he obtained possession of them. His brother, also, aided him by winning over Roger, bishop of Sarum, then chief justiciary and regent of the kingdom, and William Corboil, archbishop of Canterbury, both of whom had been most forward in taking the oaths of fealty to Matilda. Matthew Paris says that Corboil made Hugh Bigod take a solemn oath that he heard Henry on his death-bed disinherit his daughter Matilda, absolve his subjects from their oaths, and declare Stephen his successor. This is scarcely credible, for the archbishop must have known that his heart had been set on his daughter's succession

Be that as it may, the archbishop, without whose consent the coronation could not have been legally performed, espoused the cause of Stephen. And so did the whole body of the clergy and nobility. Roger, bishop of Sarum, having declared that the vows of allegiance taken by them to Matilda were null and void, because she was married out of the realm of England, no opposition was offered to the election, and Stephen was crowned by the primate, on the 26th of December, at Westminster.

At his coronation, Stephen swore to whatever his prelates and nobles pleased to dictate, and he confirmed what he had sworn to by a charter. This charter was ratified and enlarged at a great council held at Oxford early in the year 1136. At this council Stephen permitted the clergy to annex this condition to their oaths of fealty: that they would obey him as their king so long as he should preserve their Church liberties and the vigour of their discipline, and no longer. This concession brought all the clergy to his side, and the confirmation of Pope Innocent II. soon followed: Innocent gave his hearty concurrence to all that had been done, and adopted Stephen as a son of the blessed Apostle Peter and the holy Roman Church.

At the outset of his reign Stephen's rule seemed to vindicate the nation's choice of a king. For some time his popularity increased rather than diminished. Some of his first acts, however, weakened rather than strengthened his power. Although raised to the throne by the consent of the great nobles, he was jealous of their power. He knew the defect in his title to the crown, and that the throne of a usurper is always in danger. The earl of Essex, indeed, discontented with his share in Stephen's liberalities, early took up arms, but was quickly defeated. To counteract the power of the great nobles, therefore, he made a lavish distribution of crown lands to numerous tenants in chief: dignifying them with the titles of earls and barons, and allowing them to build castles. Square fortresses with loop-holes and battlements were erected on many a bleak hill; for other lay barons besides these crown tenants were allowed to build them. The evils which arose from this privilege quickly became manifest. With bands of armed men to aid them, these petty barons generally became robbers. They seized the corn in their neighbours' barns; the herds in the adjacent pastures; and sometimes robbed and even murdered wayfarers in the highways. The measure, therefore, which Stephen adopted to counteract the power of the great barons had in the end the effect of weakening his own and disturbing the peace of the whole kingdom.

At first, however, all went "merry as a marriage bell." The court which he held in London during the festival of Easter was, the old chroniclers say, more magnificent than any that had been seen in England. In Normandy, also, Stephen was received as their duke with the same unanimity. The Earl of Anjou marched into the duchy to assert the rights of his wife Matilda, but repugnance to the rule of a female armed the Normans to the teeth, and he was compelled to conclude a truce with Stephen for two years. When Stephen went to the continent, A.D. 1137, the Normans swore allegiance to him; and Louis VII. of France met him in Normandy, and contracted an alliance with him, agreeing to give his youngest sister Constance in marriage to his son Eustace, and granting the investiture of the duchy to his future brother-in-law, who was then a mere child.

Meanwhile a storm was gathering round the head of King Stephen. David, king of Scotland, had, in A.D. 1136, entered England to vindicate the rights of Matilda, and had overrun the counties of Cumberland and Northumberland, but Stephen had averted a war by ceding to him the county of Cumberland and city of Carlisle, and by conferring the earldom of Huntingdon on his eldest son, Prince Henry. David laid claim to the earldom of Northumberland for Prince Henry, and Stephen promised to examine his pretensions. It was claimed for the young prince as grandson and heir of Waltheof, the last Saxon earl, but Stephen was in no haste to take it into consideration. When, indeed, called upon for his decision, in A.D. 1138, Stephen, who had returned to England, rejected the demand made by David's ambassadors. King David, therefore, prepared for war. Nor was he the only antagonist Stephen was called upon to encounter. Robert, earl of Gloucester, natural son of Henry, had, in the previous year, re-appeared in England, and had taken the oath of fealty and homage to Stephen; but while he took those oaths he was secretly intriguing with the nobles in favour of his half-sister Matilda. He had taken that oath with this remarkable condition:—"that he should be no longer bound to observe it than Stephen kept his engagements to him and maintained him in all his rights and liberties:" he having large estates in England. It does not appear that Stephen had invaded the rights and liberties of Robert, earl of Gloucester, but, notwithstanding, when David, king of Scots, was preparing to invade England, he withdrew his homage; the Pope and clergy, it is recorded, having satisfied his conscience that he was not bound to observe his oath of fealty to him, but that which he had formerly made to support the cause of Matilda. Robert, earl of Gloucester, therefore, sent a message of defiance to Stephen, utterly renouncing his homage, and at the same time other barons fell from his side and retired to their fortified castles.

It was at this juncture that David, king of Scotland, crossed the Tweed. He had with him as wild a host as ever crossed the border. His "Scottish ants," as an old writer calls them, were gathered from the Lowlands and Highlands; from the Isles and from the great promontory of Galloway; from the Cheviot Hills, and that nursing-place of lawless warriors, the border-land. Great violence was exercised by this wild host, as they traversed the country lying between the Tweed and and the Tees, for though David himself was, for the age, a civilized monarch, he had no power to restrain their lawless ravages. So rapidly did they advance that Stephen was not able to reach the scene of hostilities. He was, in truth, besieging the castles of his disaffected barons: "traitors," as he called them, who had made him king and then "lifted up their heels against him." But the north had brave defenders in the churchmen. Thurstan, the aged archbishop of York, called out the population under the banners of the Saxon saints, and a large army

assembled to resist the invaders. Ralph, bishop of Durham, took the command of that army, which consisted of Norman chivalry and English archers. The opposing forces met at Northallerton. Thurstan was not able from infirmities to put on his coat-of-mail, but he inspired his forces with courage: victory, he said, was certain, and Paradise the meed of all who fell in battle. He made them swear that they would never desert each other; he gave them his blessing, and he remitted their sins. Thus they went into battle. In their midst was a tall cross surrounded by the banners of St. Cuthbert, St. Wilfrid, and St. John of Beverley: sure pledges of victory. The Scotch fought with darts and long spears, and attacked the solid mass of English and Normans gathered round their standard fiercely, but in vain: it is recorded that eleven thousand Scots fell dead upon the field, and those who escaped the slaughter fled in confusion. This "Battle of the Standard" was decisive, for though David collected his scattered forces at Carlisle, and subsequently reduced the castle of Wark, in the next year, 1139, he concluded a peace. By this treaty of peace, however, the earldom of Northumberland was granted to Prince Henry, so that one object of the invasion was at least accomplished.

Had Stephen understood the spirit of the age, the issue of the "Battle of the Standard" might have given stability to his throne. But he was singularly ignorant of that spirit; and in that ignorance he engaged in a contest full of peril to his sovereignty. He had not only been relieved from the assaults of Scotland chiefly through the aged archbishop of York, but he had been personally successful against some of his disaffected barons. He had captured the castles of Hereford, Shrewsbury, and what was of still greater importance, the strong fortress of Dover. It is true that Robert, earl of Gloucester, still had possession by his garrisons of the castles of Bristol and Leeds, and that other barons held out against him in various places; but London and some of the larger towns were stedfast in their allegiance to him. And then the churchmen, by whom he had been chiefly raised to sovereignty, were still his warm supporters. As we have seen, not only had prelates exercised their influence for him, but had doffed their canonicals, and had clad themselves in armour to fight for his cause. In an evil moment, however, Stephen aroused the hostility of the churchmen. There were three bishops whose power and intrigues he had cause to dread: Roger, bishop of Salisbury, and his two nephews, Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, and Nigel, bishop of Ely. All these bishops were men of learning and taste. Roger, as treasurer and justiciary to Henry, had accumulated vast wealth, of which he made a noble use. He was a liberal patron of learned men, architects and artists, and he was a great builder of ecclesiastical structures. The cathedral of Salisbury, rebuilt by him, was as magnificent a structure as any cathedral in England. Alexander, also, rebuilt the Cathedral of Lincoln. But these bishops not only erected cathedrals, they also built castles. As barons as well as prelates, they had knight service to perform, and as Stephen had given the barons permission to erect castles, they availed themselves of that privilege. Roger had castles at Devizes, Sherborne, and Malmesbury, and Alexander at Newark and other places. Nigel was no castle builder, for he was too fond of hawks and hounds to spend money in erecting fortified places. But the whole family were powerful, and Stephen had grown jealous of that power. Next to his brother, the bishop of Winchester, Roger, bishop of Sarum, had contributed more to Stephen's elevation to the throne than any other churchman, and he was rewarded with extravagant gifts for his services, as he had been previously rewarded by Henry. But Stephen seems to have fostered his rapacity in the conviction that his pride would have a speedier fall. He was accustomed to say that he

SALISBURY CATHEDRAL.

would give Roger the half of his kingdom if asked for it; and that till the time was ripe he should tire of asking before his requests were refused. That time was ripe in July, A.D. 1139. In that month a great council was held at Oxford, and the three prelates were summoned to attend. It is said that they obeyed the summons with doubt and hesitation, but they went to Oxford with military and secular pomp, and with an escort that "became the wonder of all beholders." It had been represented to Stephen that Roger was meditating treachery: that he was about to espouse the cause of Matilda. In truth, Stephen did not know at this time who were his friends or who were his foes. Besides, he was in need of money for the support of his mercenaries, and to satisfy the grasping nobles by whom he was surrounded, and this had as much to do with the resolve he had taken to ruin Roger and his nephew as his dread of their power. But a pretext was needed before they could be proceeded against, for there were no proofs that they were traitorous. That pretext was soon supplied. On their arrival at Oxford a quarrel arose between the bishops' retainers and those of Alan, earl of Brittany, concerning quarters: swords were drawn, and some were wounded and slain on both sides. Contemporary historians assert that this quarrel was designedly raised, and from the eagerness with which

Stephen took advantage of it there appears to be no question about it: especially as his vengeance fell on Roger, the prelate, and not Alan, the earl. Affecting

OXFORD CASTLE.

to be indignant at this breach of the peace, he commanded the arrest of the bishop and his nephews. Roger and Alexander were arrested, but Nigel fled to his uncle's strongest castle: that of Devizes. As an atonement for their offence of breaking the peace, Stephen demanded the surrender of all the castles of the two bishops, and though the demand was first refused, it was finally complied with. Nigel prepared to bid defiance to Stephen in the castle of Devizes, but on his threatening to keep Roger and his nephew Alexander without food, after they had been kept three whole days in a "fearful fast," Nigel surrendered. In that castle Stephen found forty thousand marks; and when he had taken possession of all their castles and treasures the bishops were set at liberty: they were reduced to a simple ecclesiastical life, and had no possessions left them but those that belonged to them as churchmen. The aged bishop of Sarum was so much affected by this reverse of fortune that he died soon after of a broken heart.

By these violent proceedings Stephen arrayed the whole body of the ecclesiastics against him. There was one universal cry throughout the kingdom that the Church and religion were on the brink of ruin. Stephen's own brother, Henry, bishop of Winchester—now the Pope's legate in England—took up the cause of the Church. Denouncing the arrest of the bishops as a crime which called aloud for vengeance, by virtue of his legantine commission he called a council of the clergy to meet at Winchester, and summoned Stephen to appear before them to answer for his conduct. It was not to be endured that prelates, whose persons were held to be sacred, and whose deeds, however vile they may have been, were not subject to a lay tribunal, or the operations of kingly or civil law, should be treated as Roger and his nephews had been. "It was a grievous sin," writes a contemporary, "resembling the wickedness of the sons of Korah and Saul." Stephen would not appear at Winchester; but Aubrey de Vere, "a man deeply versed in legal affairs," appeared to plead his cause. De Vere aggravated the circumstances of the quarrel at Oxford. Roger and his nephews were, he said, alone to blame for the bloodshed there; adding that whenever the bishop came to court, his retainers, presuming on his power, excited tumults, and that Roger secretly favoured the cause of Matilda. On the other hand, the legate painted the injustice, violence, and cruelty of his brother Stephen's conduct in the blackest colours. The three bishops, he said, were ready to abide their trial before a proper tribunal, but he demanded as of right before they were thus tried that their castles and property should be restored. This was refused, and the council adjourned. On the second day of the council, the archbishop of Rouen appeared to advocate the cause of Stephen. He contended that it was against the canon law that prelates should hold castles; that even if they had the right, they were bound to deliver them up at the king's will, seeing that his throne was in danger; and that the king was bound to make war for the common security. But the prelates present were not of his opinion: their temper was stern and uncompromising. They had been told by the legate in his opening address to the council that nothing whatever should deter him from putting their sentence, whatever it might be, into execution; that neither the fear of losing his brother's favour, or even of losing his own life, should turn him from the path of duty. The sentence of the council would no doubt have been that of excommunication had not some of the nobles laid their hands upon their swords, and had not De Vere taken the dangerous and humiliating step of appealing to the Pope in the king's name. Or it may be, as one authority states, that Stephen, in order to abate the rigour of ecclesiastical discipline, made submissions to the council. But if he did submit it was too late.

The synod at Winchester was dissolved on the first day of September, and during that month Robert, earl of Gloucester, and the Empress Matilda were in England. They had but a small force when they landed, and yet it is said that "all England was struck with alarm in various ways: those who secretly or openly favoured the invaders being roused to more than usual activity against the king, while his own partisans were terrified as if a thunderbolt had fallen." They landed at Arundel, where Adelais, the queen, widow of Henry, was residing; and while Matilda took refuge in the castle of Arundel with her stepmother, Robert crossed the country to Bristol. Stephen invested the castle of Arundel, and might have captured both the dames; but, on being appealed to by Adelais, in the most romantic spirit of chivalry he allowed her to remain undisturbed in her castle, and permitted Matilda to pass out and take her way to Bristol to join Robert of Gloucester; Stephen's own brother, the bishop of Winchester, escorting her thither to secure her safe arrival. In the meantime Robert had been active in collecting his friends, and it was soon seen that Stephen had cause to fear for his throne. Most of the chiefs in the north and west declared for the empress; but in other parts of the

kingdom the barons were not so ready to espouse her cause. They weighed the chances of success; or sought to ascertain which party, Stephen or Matilda, would give them the most ample recompense for their services. At length, however, the most active chiefs chose their sides; the horrors of civil war rent the kingdom.

The year 1140 was one of the most calamitous that England ever witnessed. War raged from one end of the kingdom to the other. The whole nation was inflamed with more than civil fury. The horrors of war were rendered more frightful by the petty barons who neither declared for Stephen nor Matilda. They set all law at defiance. They garrisoned their castles, and spoiled, tortured, and murdered their neighbours without distinction of party. Their castles, indeed, were no better than dens of robbers; or, as the author of the old Saxon chronicle calls them, "devils." To make matters worse, freebooters, also, came from Flanders to take their part in the general pillage; and the distress was heightened by a frightful scarcity and the almost total extinction of commerce. As regards the war between the opposing armies, it consisted this year of surprises, skirmishes, and sieges; for there was no general action that contributed to bring the quarrel to a period. Towns, villages, churches, and monasteries were everywhere burnt to the ground, and torrents of the noblest blood of England were shed, but there were no signs of peace. The confusion of the kingdom was so great that it is recorded "neighbour could put no faith in his nearest neighbour, nor the friend in his friend, nor the brother in his own brother." All was confusion and dismay.

In order to illustrate the character of the war and the state of society at this period a few incidents will suffice. A detachment of the earl of Gloucester's soldiers, under Robert FitzHerbert, surprised the castle of Devizes, which Stephen had taken from the bishop of Salisbury. With a refined cruelty, FitzHerbert rubbed his prisoners with honey and exposed them to the sun. But he was not faithful to Matilda. Having obtained possession of Devizes, he kept it for himself, and commenced the subjection of the neighbourhood for his own profit. But FitzHerbert found others as treacherous as himself. John FitzGilbert held the castle of Marlborough, and FitzHerbert having a desire to be lord of that castle, also, went there as a guest in the hope of his being able to gain admission for his followers. But he was caught as in a trap. He was detained as a prisoner, and was afterwards conducted by Robert, earl of Gloucester, to the castle of Devizes and hanged.

Meanwhile King Stephen was not inactive. He had, on the breaking out of the war, sworn "by God's birth," that the disaffected barons should "never call him a deposed king," and he fought bravely to maintain his assertion. His first operation was against Bristol, which failed; the head-quarters of Matilda and Robert, earl of Gloucester, defied his power. Stephen, however, gained many advantages over their adherents in the west; and crushed a formidable insurrection in the east, headed by Nigel, bishop of Ely. At that time Matilda had transferred her standard to Gloucester, and while Stephen was in the east the flames of war were rekindled in the west; Nigel, who had fled thither, being one of its most distinguished leaders. But Nigel was not the only prelate who clothed himself in armour and mounted a war horse. Stephen hastened to the west to meet the insurgents, but he had scarcely arrived there when he was again recalled to the "land of fens," on the east. Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, had collected Nigel's scattered forces, and, in alliance with the earls of Lincoln and Chester, had made himself formidable. Stephen's own imprudence had arrayed these earls against him. They were his avowed friends, but he had withheld the castle of Lincoln from William de Roumare, the earl of Lincoln, and he and his brother, the earl of Chester, espoused the cause of Matilda. While Stephen was in the west the castle of Lincoln was taken by surprise; a surprise equally characteristic of the period as those before recorded.

As the garrison of Lincoln were indulging in sports to relieve the dull tedium of their monotonous life, the countess of Chester and her sister-in-law, the countess of Lincoln, paid a visit to the lady of the knight who had the defence of the castle for King Stephen. They were the avowed friends of the king, as well as their husbands, and it was only an act of politeness to pay a visit to the wife of the knight who was in the king's service. It was equally polite on the part of the earl of Chester to step in as he did, without his armour or even his mantle, to have a chat with the knight's lady. Nothing could be more natural or courteous. It is true the earl had three soldiers in attendance upon him, but so great a man in those perilous times could not make even morning calls without armed attendants. All therefore were readily admitted into the castle: the fair countess, the earl, and the three soldiers. The garrison of Lincoln did not dream of a surprise, for what could three soldiers effect against such numbers? But these three men-at-arms were sufficient to secure Lincoln Castle for Matilda. On a sudden the guards were mastered by them, and the earl of Lincoln, with his many armed followers, rushed through the gates thrown open to receive them, and the castle was captured. It was this event that recalled Stephen to the east. The townspeople of Lincoln still adhered to his cause, and with their assistance he laid siege to the fortress. This was on Christmas Day, A.D. 1140. At that time the earl of Chester was not within the walls of the castle; he had retired to his earldom to raise an army among his vassals, and to seek the assistance of his father-in-law, Robert, earl of Gloucester. Robert had been offended with him for so long and steadily adhering to the cause of Stephen; but readily complied with his request. His daughter, the countess of Chester, was beleaguered in Lincoln Castle, and he was desirous of delivering her from danger. Moreover, the support of two such powerful barons as the earls of Lincoln and Chester was of the greatest importance to the cause of Matilda, and he hastened to join the forces collected by his son-in-law, and to march to the relief of Lincoln Castle. It was in February, A.D. 1141, that they approached its walls, when they found to their great joy that it was not captured. It was on the feast of the Purification that the two armies faced each other in order of battle. Stephen was exhorted not to fight on that solemn festival, and also to raise the siege in order that he

might employ his whole strength against his enemies. But Stephen's courage was greater than his piety or his prudence. All eager for battle, he drew out his forces; placing his cavalry on the two wings, and his infantry in the centre. Robert of Gloucester drew out his forces in a similar position. There was considerable disparity in the numbers, for Stephen's forces had recently become greatly thinned by battles and desertions. There were, moreover, traitors in his camp on this eventful day, for his cavalry either deserted to the enemy or fled at the first onset. His infantry was more faithful to his cause; and, dismounting his warhorse he placed himself at their head and fought like a lion. But it was in vain. After he had broken both his battle-axe and sword in the terrible conflict, he was taken prisoner by William de Kaines, who, seeing him defenceless, seized him by the helmet, exclaiming, "I have taken the king!"

The generosity displayed by Stephen, when he had Matilda in his power at Arundel Castle, was forgotten by her in her hour of triumph. True to the stern policy of her race, she loaded him with chains and threw him into a dungeon in Bristol Castle. His defeat was the triumph of the great ecclesiastics, who, with many of the nobles, made their submission to Matilda. One of the foremost of the ecclesiastics to submit was Stephen's own brother, Henry of Winchester, induced thereto, it is said, by the promise of being Matilda's prime minister, and of having all vacancies in bishoprics and abbacies placed at his disposal. It was on the downs near Winchester that Matilda made her bargain with Henry of Winchester, the pope's legate, and other ecclesiastics who supported him: she swearing that in all matters of importance she would obey the Church, and they pledging their faith to her on these conditions. This was on the 2nd of March, "a day dark and tempestuous, portending disasters." The day following, Matilda went in triumph to the cathedral of Winchester, where the legate blessed all those who would obey her rule, and cursed all those who refused to submit to it. On the Saturday, Matilda took possession of the royal castle, with the crown and other regalia, but found very little money. Matilda kept the festival of Easter with great pomp at Oxford, where an assembly of churchmen and nobles was convened to ratify her accession. All were agreed beforehand that she should ascend the throne, so that there remained little to do except making their will known publicly. It was the legate's office to do this, and he did it in plain, outspoken terms. Having passed a high encomium on the felicity of the reign of the late King Henry, he mentioned that they had sworn to him to support the succession of his daughter Matilda, but that she having delayed to come to take possession of her throne, his brother Stephen had been permitted to reign. Having made this excuse for the wholesale outbreaking of the churchmen and nobles, the legate boldly denounced his brother. He had, he said, violated all his engagements, especially those made to the Church, for "which crimes God had rejected him and given him into the hands of his enemies." Under these circumstances, he continued, they had met to provide for the tranquillity of the kingdom by appointing some one to fill his throne. Then in the most unblushing manner he asserted that the right of electing a king belonged chiefly to the clergy. "And now," he said, "in order that the kingdom might not be without a ruler, *we* the clergy of England, to whom it chiefly belongs to elect kings and ordain them, having invoked, as it is fitting, the direction of the Holy Spirit, did and do elect Matilda, the daughter of that good, pacific, glorious, and incomparable King Henry, to be the sovereign lady of England and Normandy." Some were silent, but many hailed the conclusion of the legate's bold speech with loud acclamations.

Thus commenced what may be called "the reign of Queen Matilda." But that reign was brief and shadowy. Her popularity commenced in the spring, but it vanished before the summer had passed away. The Londoners were still faithful to King Stephen. After the clergy had elected the "sovereign lady" Matilda to the throne, a deputation from London was introduced to the council. They did not appear to take part in the election of a ruler, but to plead for the liberation of King Stephen. They were sent by their fraternity, they said, to entreat their "lord King Stephen" might be released from captivity. The whole community of London, with all the barons lately admitted into it, earnestly desired this of the legate, the archbishop, and the clergy. They did not dispute with the council on their choice of a ruler; but their pleading for Stephen's liberation was a tacit disapproval of their proceedings. Queen Maud also sent a letter to the council, by Christian, her chaplain, in which she called upon the clergy, by the oaths of allegiance they had taken to her husband, to rescue him from his imprisonment. But the council turned a deaf ear both to the Londoners and Queen Maud. Their sitting was concluded on the third day by the legate pronouncing a sentence of excommunication on several persons who still adhered to the cause of Stephen, and especially on one William Martel, who had recently plundered his, the legate's, baggage.

Before they left Winchester, the deputation of the Londoners promised the legate to recommend his view of the matter to their fellow-citizens. It was some time, however, before they could tolerate the idea of being under the rule of Matilda. The earl of Gloucester had much to do to reconcile them so far as to allow her to make her appearance in their city. He soothed and flattered them, and held out rich prospects of reward, and at length, a few days before midsummer, she entered London in great pomp and state. But Stephen was still the sovereign of their choice, and much circumspection was needed on the part of Matilda if she wished effectually to conciliate the affections of the Londoners. But circumspection was not a trait in her imperious character. Preparations were made for her coronation at Westminster, but by her own conduct she set aside that ceremony. She was haughty even to her most faithful friends; what, then, could the citizens of London expect from her? Not only were all the fair promises Robert of Gloucester had made them broken, but she demanded submission of them as a punishment for their attachment to the cause of Stephen; and when they presented a petition to her, praying for the abolition of certain changes and usages introduced by the Normans, and the restoration

of the laws of Edward the Confessor, she rejected it with scorn. As usual in those times, on her ascending the throne, there was a wholesale confiscation of estates, in which not even the family of the legate were spared; and those of the Church not excepted. Henry of Winchester desired that Prince Eustace, his nephew, and the eldest son of Stephen, should be put in possession of all the patrimonial rights of his father, but was flatly refused. In raising Matilda to the throne the legate had not bargained for the ruin of his family; and from that moment he became her enemy. But Matilda's conduct to Queen Maud, who appeared before her in London with many of the nobility to petition for her husband's release, embittered the public mind against her more than all her arbitrary proceedings. Maud, who was her cousin, only met with scorn and contumely. But Maud was not defenceless. She had many partisans in Kent and Surrey, and about the feast of St. John the Baptist and near noonday, a body of horse from those counties suddenly appeared on the southern side of the river opposite the city; and their appearance was the signal for a general rising. At the sound of the city church bells the people "rose upon the countess of Anjou and her adherents, as swarms of bees rushing from their hives." Instead of being crowned at Westminster, Matilda, mounted on a fleet horse, fled from the city, and she had scarcely left her apartments at Westminster when the populace rushed in and pillaged or destroyed all that was found in it. Matilda with a few friends retired to Oxford.

Meanwhile the legate had refrained from going to court, and had been busy in manning his castles within the limits of his diocese. Matilda had offended him beyond forgiveness. Suspecting his fidelity, she marched suddenly to Winchester, accompanied by David, king of Scots, the earl of Gloucester, and several barons with their vassals. Having taken up her residence in the royal castle, she sent a messenger to the legate to come to court on business of importance. He replied that he would make ready to attend her as quickly as possible, but it was in a different sense than that of obedience. His episcopal palace was well fortified; and Stephen's banner was soon seen floating on its roofs. Leaving it to the care of his garrison, the legate sallied forth to gather his friends around him. Messengers were sent to Queen Maud, who was at the head of a body of troops in Kent, to the Londoners, and to others who adhered to the cause of Stephen, to march with all haste to Winchester. In a brief period the legate found himself at the head of a powerful army, and Matilda, who had in vain laid siege to his episcopal palace, was compelled to take refuge in the castle. It was invested on all sides, and although fierce sallies were made by the besieged, they were of no avail, Six weeks passed away, and famine stared them in the face: there was no alternative but surrender or flight. It was the custom at that period for belligerents to relax their vigilance on the great festivals of the Church; and on the 14th of September—the festival of the Holy Rood or Cross—at the dawn of day, Matilda, mounted on a fleet horse, accompanied by a strong escort, suddenly left the precincts of the castle. Robert, earl of Gloucester, with a number of knights, followed to protect her from pursuers. They took the road to Devizes, and the legate's adherents were soon in hot pursuit. Gloucester and his knights were overtaken at Stourbridge, where he was taken prisoner, and of all who were with him only the earl of Hereford escaped, and he arrived almost naked at Gloucester Castle. Others escaped from the field and sought their homes; but, betrayed by their Norman accent, they were seized by the English peasantry, who bound them with cords, and driving them "with whips, as though they were cattle," delivered them into the hands of their enemies. Matilda reached the castle of Devizes in safety, from whence she was afterwards carried in a litter to Gloucester, half dead with terror and fatigue; and David, king of Scots, who fled with her, was fortunate enough to get back to his kingdom. The earl of Gloucester was confined in Rochester Castle, but by a convention made soon after between the two parties he was exchanged for King Stephen.

King Stephen, therefore, was restored to his throne. He now had the full support of the legate, his brother. Henry of Winchester found himself in an embarrassing position, but he put a bold front upon it. In December he summoned a council of the clergy at Westminster, in which he took a part in direct opposition to that which he had taken in the council at Winchester. But he had his excuse. The Pope, he said, had commanded him by letter to do all in his power to effect his brother's liberation, and such an order could not be disobeyed. Besides, he said, it was through fear, and not from conviction or good-will, he had supported Matilda; and as she had broken all her engagements to him, he was freed from his oath of allegiance to her. He added that God had punished "the countess of Anjou" for her perfidy, and had restored the rightful king to his throne. Every word he uttered had the full assent of the council, and the legate finally, with a coolness which must have created astonishment among those who heard him, excommunicated the adherents of Matilda, as only eight months before he had those of King Stephen!—the curse including all those who should henceforth build castles or invade the rights and privileges of the Church. Stephen, who was present at this council, complained bitterly of the wrongs he had endured from his vassals, but, he added, if the nobles would aid him with men and money, he would relieve them from the hard yoke of a woman.

Civil war now, A.D. 1142, raged more fiercely than ever. The evils of feudality scourged the land from one end to the other. After his restoration, Stephen had a long and dangerous illness, during which Matilda took refuge in Oxford, a city fortified by the Thames, a wall, and an impregnable castle. Recovered from his illness, Stephen marched to Oxford, defeated the garrison, who met him in the open field, entered the city with them, set fire to the town, and besieged Matilda in the castle. His troops surrounded it on all sides, but after three months had passed away it was still uncaptured. Winter had arrived; one of great severity, for there was a deep snow, and the Thames was frozen over; the provisions of the garrison were failing, and there seemed no chance of escape. Matilda seemed lost, but in the dead of the night, on the 20th of December, she, with three

knights all dressed in white, escaped from the doomed citadel, and passing through the posts unobserved, fled to Abingdon on foot, and then took horse to Wallingford. At Wallingford she was met by the earl of Gloucester and young Prince Henry, who were marching with an army to her relief; and soon after fortune again turned in her favour, for Stephen, who had taken the castle of Oxford, was defeated at Wilton, and with his brother the legate narrowly escaped being taken prisoner.

There was at this period universal turmoil and desolation. There had been a golden harvest in the field, but there were no reapers to gather in the corn. Many cultivators had fled from the country, while others had built themselves hovels in the churchyard wherein to live, hoping that the sanctity of the place would afford them protection. Many of the churches were fortified; their towers being furnished with engines of war. Fosses were even dug in the very cemeteries. As for the cities, some of them were depopulated; for foreign mercenaries prowled over the land for plunder, and the people fled at their approach. For a long time during this storm of tyranny the bishops remained inactive, and when they did rouse themselves it was rather to increase than mitigate the general misery. Milo, earl of Hereford, demanded money of the bishop of Hereford, and being refused, he seized both the goods and the lands of the prelate, for which he, with all his adherents and the whole country around, was laid under an interdict. During this state of things there was no action of any importance for three whole years after the battle of Wilton. The barons of the opposing parties plundered each other's lands and attacked each other's castles, but the war between Stephen and Matilda languished; Stephen holding his ground in the east and Matilda in the west. The earl of Gloucester was attending Prince Henry's education at Bristol Castle: he being the most learned as well as the most virtuous nobleman of his age. Meanwhile Geoffrey of Anjou had become master of Normandy, and the Norman barons had acknowledged Henry as their rightful duke. The young prince returned to the continent A.D. 1147, and his departure was followed in the same year by the deaths of the earls of Gloucester and Hereford, with other nobles; and then Matilda, after eight years of desperate adventure, retired from the kingdom.

The departure of Matilda, however, was not followed by peace. Her barons still defended themselves against King Stephen. And they were favoured in their struggle by Stephen's own conduct. Unwise as ever, he sought to deprive the barons of his own party of their castles, and became involved in another fatal quarrel with the Church. A change of Popes through death had deprived his brother Henry of his legantine office, which had been given to Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen's declared enemy. The hostility of Theobald was rendered formidable by his alliance with Hugh Bigod, the powerful earl of Norfolk. Stephen exiled Theobald for attending the council of Rheims against his express orders, and Theobald excommunicated Stephen and his adherents. One-half of the kingdom was laid under the archbishop's interdict.

> "All sacred things are covered; cheerful morn
> Grows sad as night; no seemly garb is worn
> Nor is a face allowed to meet a face
> With natural smile of greeting. Bells are dumb,
> Ditches are graves, funereal rites denied,
> And in the churchyard he must take his bride
> Who dare be wedded."—*Wordsworth.*

This was a state of things men could not bear. The great body of the people held the consolations of religion to be their most precious heritage, and to be thus deprived of them was worse than death itself. Stephen was compelled to humble himself before the Church. He made submission, and endeavoured to win the hearts of the bishops and abbots by bestowing large donations on the Church: promising still more ample bounties when the kingdom should be settled. But in all this Stephen had an end in view. When he fancied he had won them over, he required the bishops to acknowledge and anoint his son Eustace as his successor. But the prelates were not to be thus cajoled. Theobald told him plainly that the Pope had denounced him as a usurper, and, therefore, he could not transmit his crown to his posterity. Enraged at this refusal, Stephen ordered his guards to arrest the bishops, and seize their temporalities, but his revenge was not put into execution; for time was bringing about a solution of the difficulties of the kingdom.

Henry of Anjou had, A.D. 1152, grown into manhood. In the previous year he had married Eleanor, the divorced wife of Louis, King of France, by which union he had become lord of Aquitaine and Poitou. Four years before he had been knighted by David, king of Scots: the ceremony being performed in "merry Carlisle." It was time for him, therefore, to win his spurs; and being strengthened by his union with Eleanor, and invited by the Plantagenet party in England, he prepared to dispute its sovereingty. He came with a well-appointed band of followers, and as soon as he landed many of his old friends joined his standard. This was in January, A.D. 1153, and though it was midwinter the flames of civil war broke out with greater violence than ever. Henry besieged the town and castle of Marlborough, and Stephen collected all his forces and attempted to raise the siege, but being prevented from executing his design by excessive rains, he returned with his army to London. Marlborough was captured, and then Prince Henry took up his quarters at Wallingford. Both parties prepared for a decisive battle. Stephen marched to Wallingford, and the two armies faced each other at Wallingford: that of Stephen, who came from London, occupying the left bank of the Thames, and that of Henry the right. But no battle was fought. Wearied at length with a struggle which had lasted fifteen years, the nobles proposed that, instead of fighting, there should be an accommodation. Their proposal was wisely adopted. King Stephen and Prince Henry had a conference, which was followed by a pacification, the terms of which were that Stephen should reign during his life, and that Henry Plantagenet should be his successor. It seems strange that Stephen should have consented to such terms, seeing that he had, when the treaty was concluded, a son living, to whom he desired to trans-

mit his crown. It is probable, however, that he found there was no chance of transmitting it to his posterity, and that his wisest course would be to secure it for himself in peace. But Eustace, the son of Stephen, did not long live to stand in the way of Henry Plantagenet. Aware of the results of the negotiations, he marched into Cambridgeshire, where, at the head of some followers who rallied round him, he took possession of the abbey of St. Edmundsbury, and plundered the surrounding country. It was a mad act, but his brain seems to have been over excited by his being thus disinherited by his own father, for, after he had seized upon the abbey, as he was sitting down to a banquet, he was suddenly seized with a frenzy, of which he died: his fate being considered by the monks to have been a sudden judgment of the Almighty for his impious ravaging of the sanctuary of the "blessed St. Edmund." After this, Stephen and Prince Henry went to Winchester, where the treaty of Wallingford was solemnly ratified in a great council; and in January, A.D. 1154, at another council held at Oxford, all the barons of both parties did homage to Prince Henry, as the future king of England.

The reign of Stephen was soon brought to a close. Having spent some time with the king at Oxford, and afterwards in London, Prince Henry returned to the continent. They parted "with expressions of mutual friendship" at the end of Lent, and on the 25th of October Stephen died, in the fiftieth year of his age. His queen Maud had died three years before, and he was buried by her side in the Monastery of Faversham.

The Saxon chronicler has thus graphically summed up the characteristics of this turbulent reign: a reign in which the nobles and ecclesiastics sought to render themselves independent of the Crown:—"In this king's time all was dissension, and evil, and rapine. The great men soon rose against him. They cruelly oppressed the wretched people of the land with their castle work. They filled their castles with devils and evil men. They seized those whom they supposed to have any goods, and threw them into prison for their gold and silver, and inflicted on them unutterable tortures. Some they hanged up by the feet and smoked with foul smoke; some by the thumbs or by the beard, and hung coats-of-mail on their feet. They threw them into dungeons with adders, and snakes, and toads. They put knotted strings about their heads, and writhed them till they went into the brain. Some they forced into a crucet-house: that is, a chest that was short and narrow, and not deep, and had sharp stones therein, so that they broke their limbs. They made many thousands perish with hunger. They laid tribute after tribute upon towns and cities, and when the townsmen had nothing more, they set fire to all the towns. Thou mightest go a whole day's journey and not find a man sitting in a town nor an acre of land tilled. The poor died of hunger, and those who had been men well to do begged for bread. Never was more mischief done by heathen invaders. This lasted the nineteen years that Stephen was king, and it grew continually worse and worse."

These miseries, however, were not brought about by King Stephen's personal character. None of those cruelties which had disgraced the reign of his predecessor have been laid to his charge by the chroniclers. Yet it was his ambition that involved the nation in these calamities. He had ascended the throne without a title, and, hence, not only was his own path strewed with thorns, but the national peace and security was disturbed as long as the crown adorned his brow. The rock on which he split was ambition.

No events of importance occurred in Wales during this period; petty wars between its several princes arising from mutual jealousies, and predatory incursions into the English territories being the sum of its history.

When Henry Beauclerc ascended the throne of England, Edgar, the eldest surviving son of Malcolm Canmore, was king in Scotland. The union of Henry with Edgar's sister, Matilda, was productive of a long and cordial peace between the two nations. During the reign of Edgar, indeed, Scotland enjoyed profound tranquillity; being neither disturbed by foreign wars nor civil commotions. According to a contemporary chronicler, Edgar was "a sweet-tempered, amiable man, in all things resembling Edward the Confessor: mild in his administration, equitable and beneficent." Such a monarch deserved a reign of peace and tranquillity. Edgar died A.D. 1107, and was succeeded by his younger brother Alexander, who married one of Henry's numerous illegitimate daughters, named Sibylla. At the commencement of this monarch's reign, according to the will of Edgar, Cumberland was dismembered from the Scottish kingdom, which by that will fell into the possession of his younger brother David. Alexander, like his brother Edgar, sedulously cultivated the friendship of Henry, king of England, and his reign is chiefly marked by an inflexible administration of justice, which procured him the name of "The Fierce," and by a warm contest with the English archbishop, who laid claim to an authority over the Scottish Church, a claim which had no foundation in right or usage, and which Alexander sternly and successfully resisted. Alexander died A.D. 1124, and leaving no issue, his throne fell to the lot of his brother David. David had been educated under the care of his uncle, Edward Atheling, in England; and after the marriage of his sister to Henry Beauclerc, he resided chiefly in the English court, where he married Maud, daughter of Waltheof, earl of Northumberland and Huntingdon, by which union he acquired a title to those two earldoms. By his tenure of the earldom of Cumberland, however, when he ascended the throne of his brother, the king of Scotland was now again an English baron, and as such he was one of the first who took the oath to support the succession of Matilda to the throne of England. His support of Matilda has been recorded in previous pages; the final result of his war with King Stephen on her behalf being, after the great battle of the Standard in which he was defeated, a treaty of peace with the English monarch, which was concluded at Durham, and by which he obtained the ostensible object of the war—the earldom of Northumberland. But David was never attached to the interests of Stephen, for he afterwards, when Matilda had for a time gained the ascendancy, repaired to her court, and, as before seen, was shut up with her in Oxford Castle,

from whence he with difficulty made his escape and returned to Scotland. From that period his reign is not marked by any events of importance. When Prince Henry invaded England, David led an army of Scots into the country to fight for his cause, and advanced as far as Lancaster, but on the approach of Stephen he recrossed the border without risking a battle. He did not live to see the issue of the contest between Stephen and Henry, for he died in May, A.D. 1153, and was succeeded by his grandson Malcolm IV. His death appears to have been hastened by that of his only son Henry, who died in the preceding year, and who is represented by the historians of the age as a virtuous and accomplished prince. David himself appears to have been an amiable monarch, and possessed of great capacity for governing his kingdom. The monkish historians have extolled his character in the highest terms, and although his donations to the Church and his founding numerous religious houses may have called forth their eulogies, he appears to have deserved them. He did more for his country than the erection of churches and monasteries; for, when relieved from foreign wars, he assiduously applied himself to the promotion of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures; the establishing of communities in towns, and the reform of the law and its administration. By his long residence in England he had acquired English manners and habits, and after his accession to the throne of Scotland, he laboured to introduce them among his own people. One thing seems certain, that under the rule of King David his subjects enjoyed great prosperity and happiness: a condition strangely contrasting with that of the more civilized people of England under the rule of his contemporary, King Stephen.

SECTION V.

HENRY II., SURNAMED PLANTAGENET.

Henry Plantagenet was besieging the castle of a rebellious baron in Normandy when he received the news of the death of Stephen, and having brought that siege to a successful issue, he prepared for his voyage to England to take possession of his throne. Storms and contrary winds detained him for some time at Barfleur, but at length, on the 8th of December, he landed at Hurst Castle, and eleven days after, he was crowned with Eleanor, his consort, at Westminster, by Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. Loud acclamations resounded through the abbey on this occasion, for it was hoped that after the long troubles endured by the country, there would be a quiet future. Besides, some Saxon blood flowed in Henry's veins, and though it was by no means pure, the people, still enamoured of their ancient dynasty, shouted "Long live King Henry!"

Although only twenty-one years of age when he began to reign, Henry possessed a firm will and commanding intellect. He commenced his rule well and wisely. His first aim was to bring order out of confusion. Much of that confusion had arisen from the employment of foreign mercenaries in the recent civil war, and they were sent back forthwith to their homes on the continent. Another source of the confusion which had existed sprang from the numerous castles erected by King Stephen's permission, the owners of which had universally become privileged robbers who plundered and oppressed all around them. These castles were levelled to the ground; some on being quietly surrendered, and others after being taken by force of arms. Before Henry proceeded to the destruction of these castles, he obtained a decree for the resumption of all the crown lands on which they had been built, and which had been lavished on their adherents both by King Stephen and Matilda. As the revenues of the crown were chiefly derived from these lands, it was essential to his kingly dignity and the support of his throne that Henry should obtain possession of them, which in a brief space of time was accomplished. Some of the more turbulent nobles were driven out of the kingdom, while others were reduced to a state of vassalage. In driving these nobles out of the land, Henry wisely made no distinction between the adherents of Stephen and Matilda; and even the bishop of Winchester, who had helped to raise him to the throne, was not spared, for all his six strong castles were demolished, and he fled with his treasures to Clugny. Henry's attention was likewise directed to the coinage of the country, which in the previous reign had been shamefully debased. Private mints had been as numerous as the castles, for the barons who occupied them cared little for kingly privileges. Henry, however, claimed the exclusive right of issuing a new coinage, and thereby restored it to its standard purity. This counter revolution was effected with as little violence as possible, for, guided by Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, Henry's policy was conciliation and peace. At the same time he governed with a firm hand; for opposition to his will was the sure precursor of ruin. His vigilance in the administration of justice was remarkable. According to a contemporary writer, he attended to it in his own person, "not sitting still in his palace as most other kings, but, going over the provinces, examined into the actions of his subjects, chiefly forming his judgment of those whom he had appointed the judges of others." Finally, in order to prevent all disputes about the succession, Henry called upon his prelates and barons to take an oath of fealty to his eldest son, Prince William, and failing him, to his second son, Prince Henry, born March, A.D. 1155.

Henry was not only king of England but duke of Normandy; and, from his marriage with Eleanor, lord of Aquitaine. The extent of his continental dominions made him a dangerous rival to his feudal superior, the king of France, and he aimed at extending his power. His father was count of Anjou, Maine, and Touraine; and at his death, which occurred shortly after his marriage with the divorced queen of France, Henry would have inherited his titles and possessions, had he not sworn that he would obey every article of his father's will. By that will he was deprived of them, for it set forth that if Henry should become king of England, they should become the inheritance of his brother Geoffrey. But notwithstanding his oath, Henry was not disposed to give up his title of earl of Anjou. He applied to the Pope to grant him a dispensation from his oath, and as he was more powerful and had more gold than his brother,

his request was readily granted. Encouraged by the French court, which could ill brook the injuries it had received from Henry's marriage with Eleanor, Geoffrey took up arms, but in the year 1156 King Henry crossed the seas and reduced all his castles; finally compelling him to consent to receive an annual pension for the disputed coronet. While on the continent, Henry did homage to his feudal superior, Louis, king of France for Normandy, Aquitaine, Poitou, Auvergne, the Limousin, Anjou, and other territories; but whilst Louis received this fealty he "had reason to tremble."

On his return to England, A.D. 1157, Henry recovered that power which David, king of Scotland, had obtained from King Stephen. The counties of Cumberland and Northumberland had passed into the possession of the Scottish crown, either as fiefs, or by especial grant, but Henry demanded their restoration of the young king Malcolm, and they were readily surrendered. Malcolm, also, did homage to him for Lothian. But there was a part of the British dominions not so easily recovered as the counties of Cumberland and Northumberland. During the recent civil war, the Welsh had, under brave chiefs, recovered much of their ancient territory, and resolved to hold it. It was Henry's policy to obliterate, as much as possible, the remembrance of the evil time that had intervened between the reign of the Red King and his accession, and he asserted his authority over Wales as a part of that policy. But the descendants of the ancient Britons were as fond of independence as their forefathers, and would not submit. Henry, therefore, led an army into Wales to subdue them. Crossing Flintshire, he threw himself among the mountains. The Welsh let him penetrate as far as a narrow and woody defile called Eulo, now Coleshill, in the parish of Holywell, when issuing from their concealment they poured down from the uplands, and as Henry's troops could not form, they were slain in heaps. The panic was universal: Henry de Essex, hereditary standard-bearer of England, threw down the royal standard, and exclaiming that the king was slain, fled for his life. Henry was in danger, but not slain: he rallied his fugitive troops, and fought his way through the pass in safety. Owen Gwynned, the Welsh chief, endeavoured to draw him into the defiles of Snowdon, but changing his route he marched along the sea-coast attended by a fleet; cutting down woods in his route, making roads, and erecting fortifications to secure the ground he had gained. There was no second battle of note, and in a few months the Welsh were compelled to purchase peace by resigning all the territories taken from King Stephen, and by giving hostages and doing homage for the rest of their country. But the Welsh were not subdued, for they subsequently, on various occasions, contested the palm of victory with the Norman chivalry; and it was long before they submitted to the dominion of "our Lord and King."

SNOWDON.

After Geoffrey Plantagenet had been deprived of his earldom of Anjou, the people of Nantes, in Lower Brittany, had offered him the government of their city, which he accepted. They had revolted from their rightful sovereign, so that it was a free election, subject to no hereditary right; and yet, on the death of Geoffrey, A.D. 1158, Henry laid claim to the earldom as his heir. It was in vain that the citizens of Nantes represented that, by choosing Geoffrey as their governor, they had not resigned their independence to a family; right or wrong he resolved upon its possession. It would almost make his continental territories complete, and therefore he laid claim to it as his property by succession. His claim, however, was disputed, for Conan, duke of Brittany, had taken possession of Nantes as belonging to his dukedom. The people of Nantes, moreover, had, on the death of Geoffrey, acknowledged Conan as their governor. But Henry affected to treat the free citizens of Nantes as rebels, and Conan as an usurper of his rights. He crossed the channel, with a formidable army, and took possession not only of the city itself, but the whole of the country between the Loire and the Vilaine. Henry was aware when he seized these territories that he should create alarm in the French court, but he relied on his art and address to quiet it. And in this he had an able coadjutor in his ministry—the famous Thomas à-Becket.

It was early in the reign of Henry that Thomas à-Becket was introduced at court. He was the son of Gilbert Becket, and was born A.D. 1119; who his mother was is uncertain. According to a monkish legend — which sober history has not rejected as positive fiction—she was the daughter of a Saracen emir. The legend relates that Gilbert, the father, went to the Holy Land on a pilgrimage, after the crusade excited by Peter the Hermit, and that during his wanderings he fell into the hands of a Saracen, by whom he was held in captivity. He was aided in his escape by the emir's daughter, who loved him, and a few years afterwards a lady was seen wandering through the streets of London, uttering no intelligible word but "London" and "Gilbert." This was the emir's daughter, who, according to the legend, found her "Gilbert," to whom she was married, and who became the mother of the famous Thomas-à-Becket. We place no faith in this monkish story, but rather believe that the mother of this remarkable man was of Saxon and not of Saracen blood. But be that as it

st early displayed great talent. He received education in the abbey of Merton, from went first to the schools of London, and university of Paris. His parents designed Church, but when he returned from Paris ic accomplishments better fitted him for the the pulpit. Notwithstanding, he entered , and Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, th his attainments, gave him several valu- ces, and made him archdeacon of his diocese. not long minister at the altar. Theobald yed him in two difficult negotiations at of which was to obtain a papal bull y bishop who should officiate at the corona- tace, son of King Stephen, if he happened to o the throne—and when Henry Plantagenet king, this piece of good service brought him l favour. Becket became King Henry's , chancellor, and chief counsellor. There reater in the court than Thomas-à-Becket, equal to him in all the kingdom, "save the ." The favours lavished upon him were l precedent: ecclesiastical and secular re- stowed upon him by Henry made him the bject in the realm. His expenditure cor- with his revenues. Household retainers round him; gold and silver vessels graced board; and the most costly delicacies were for his table. It is said that on one occa- of eels was procured at the princely price dred shillings. So great was his expendi- d, that it gave rise to a suspicion that his vere doubled by the venality common to the which his judicial office was administered. to FitzStephen, his secretary, his ostenta- s remarkable as that of Cardinal Wolsey in of Henry VIII. His rooms, it is true, fashion of the age, were littered, as stables with straw; but they glittered with the nificence of rich furniture, amidst which ellor and his retainers—barons and knights in gorgeous apparel, and sat down to quets.

as the minister sent by Henry Plantagenet rt of France to allay the alarms raised by e seizure of Nantes and the adjacent country he Loire and the Vilaine. He went with show. With him were two hundred barons ts, and a train consisting of nearly a thou- ns. Was there ever such a subject as this omas à-Becket? He marched through the France with waggons and sumpter-horses h treasures. On every horse there sat a then, when monkeys were not so well-known now, a grand feature in the gorgeous caval- they passed along, two hundred and fifty verses and waved standards brilliant with d gold, while esquires bore the shields of ts, and soldiers and priests rode two and French, accustomed as they were then to e dazzled by such magnificence. "How ," they exclaimed, "must the king of Eng- elf be, if his chancellor travels in such ut from all that appears there was a striking etween the cavalcade of King Henry and that of his chancellor, Thomas-à-Becket. Henry despised pomp and ceremony, and when *he* repaired to the court of France to join his minister, no mention is made by the chroniclers of any grand display. He had but one object in view, that of winning over the French monarch, and, aided by Thomas-à-Becket, that was soon accomplished. The neutrality of Louis was purchased by the contraction of an alliance of marriage with Henry's eldest son and the French monarch's eldest daughter Margaret, by his second queen, Constantia of Castile. Margaret's dower consisted of three castles in the Vexin, which were to be consigned to the keeping of the Knights Templars, who were to deliver them up when the marriage was consummated, or to restore them to Louis if the contract should be broken off by death or accident. Henry was magnificently entertained at the court of Paris, and while there he obtained a commission, as earl of Anjou and seneschal of France, to determine a controversy which had long existed between Eudo, earl of Penthievre, and Conan, duke of Brittany, about the right to that dukedom. On his return that question was soon settled. Nantes was freely given up to Henry, and judgment was pronounced as freely in Conan's favour. It would appear also that Henry affianced his son Geoffrey to Constantia, an infant daughter of Conan, who engaged at his death to bequeath to her all his right to Brittany.

Thus, by policy and power, Henry, king of England, was continually enlarging his dominions. His ambition was all-absorbing. Wide as his territories were on the continent, he yet courted more. His next step was to lay claim to the earldom of Toulouse. Philippa, the mother of Queen Eleanor, was the only issue of William IV., count of Toulouse, and would have inherited his dominions had he not, in order to preserve the succession in the male line, conveyed all his dominions to his brother, Raymond de St. Gilles, whose grandson of the same name at this period enjoyed the earldom. Henry now laid claim to it in right of his wife, hoping thereby to extend his power across the isthmus that joins France to Spain, and to range along the French coast on the Mediterranean as he did already on that on the Atlantic. When queen of France, Eleanor had conveyed her rights to her husband Louis, who had sent an army to occupy Toulouse; but this expedition ended in a treaty by which Raymond, on marrying Constance, the sister of Louis, remained in possession of the country. As Eleanor had been divorced from Louis, Henry conceived that she was thereby restored to her original rights, and on the advice of Thomas à-Becket he demanded the instant surrender of the earldom, and when this was refused he prepared for war. As usual with the monarchs of the Norman period, he came over to England to obtain the means for his enterprise. This was early in the year 1159. A great council of his prelates, barons, and military tenants was held, and though they were not willing to engage personally in this distant expedition, they readily supplied him with money. A scutage of one hundred and eighty thousand pounds was imposed on the knights' fees, equal in value to two millions seven hundred thousand pounds of our present money, and this having been obtained, Henry returned to Normandy. On his

return thither a similar tax was levied from his military tenants in that country, and he then collected a large army of adventurers, or soldiers of fortune, for his enterprise. In the meantime, Raymond had made preparations for resistance; and Louis, king of France, whose hostility was aroused by Henry's pretensions to Toulouse, had marched with an army to Raymond's assistance. Henry's boldest adviser in this war was Thomas à-Becket. Henry's army consisted chiefly of the famous infantry of the Low Countries; but in his train were Malcolm, king of Scotland, Raymond, king of Arragon—to whose infant daughter Henry had affianced his son Richard—one of the Welsh princes, and some English and foreign princes. Thomas-à-Becket, chancellor of England, the inseparable companion of his master, was also there, "and none went thither in more warlike guise." Becket marched at the head of seven hundred knights, equipped and maintained at his own expense, and at the capture of Cahors, which was taken in their route to Toulouse, he mounted the deadly breach with his cavalry. At length Henry's army appeared before the city of Toulouse. The King of France was within its walls, and Becket advised Henry to take the city by assault, and make the French monarch prisoner. Henry rejected this bold advice. He had scruples about a direct attack on his feudal superior. It was considered by him not only to be inconsistent with his oath of fealty, but a dangerous example to set to his own vassals if he should make war upon the person of his liege lord. Henry, therefore, declared that out of respect to the king of France, he would not besiege Toulouse. A French army, moreover, came to the relief of the French king while Henry was encamped before the city, and Henry, leaving the supreme command to Becket, returned to Normandy. The clerical chancellor continued the war, and captured three castles in Languedoc, supposed to have been impregnable; but a French force having made a diversion on the side of Normandy, he rejoined the king, leaving only a few insignificant garrisons to preserve his conquests. But the war on the frontiers of Normandy was soon ended: the French king having been induced to treat, Becket was charged with the negotiations, which he conducted with his usual ability. A truce was concluded, which, in A.D. 1160, was converted into a formal peace. By that treaty Henry was permitted to retain the castles which had been captured in the earldom of Toulouse, and his eldest son did homage to Louis for the duchy of Normandy.

This peace, however, was of very short duration. Having lost his queen Constance, and having no male issue, Louis, king of France, after a widowhood of only twelve days, married Adelais, sister of the earls of Blois, Sancerre and Champagne. Alarmed in his turn at this increase of the French king's power, and his alliance with the inveterate enemies of his family, Henry prevailed upon the Pope's legate to celebrate the espousals between his son Henry, who was seven years of age, and Margaret, the daughter of Louis, then only three years of age, and when the ceremony was concluded, he demanded and obtained of the Knights Templars the infant's dower—the three castles in the Vexin. Enraged at this transaction, the French monarch banished the three Knights Templars who had held the castles in trust, and commenced hostilities against Henry. But the operations of this war were of small importance. Louis was no match for the powerful and politic Henry. A few lances were shivered, and two or three castles besieged; but neither of the kings were disposed to attack each other in person, and about Midsummer, A.D. 1161, peace was concluded.

Henry remained in Normandy till January, A.D. 1163, when he returned to England. Becket had returned before his master. The see of Canterbury had become vacant, A.D. 1161, by the death of the archbishop Theobald. During thirteen months Henry appropriated the revenues of the primacy to his own use. They were of service in his diplomacy and war. When, however, he had accomplished all he desired on the continent—at least for a time—he turned his thoughts to the filling up of the primacy. Many of the English bishops had sought the dignity, but Henry turned a deaf ear to their suits. There was one man among his subjects whom he delighted to honour above all others—his companion and friend, Thomas à-Becket. And he had good reason for this, inasmuch as Becket was devoted to his master's interests. He had been most diligent in his endeavours to humble the subject in order to exalt the king. In his capacity of chancellor he had not only greatly humbled the lay aristocracy but had attacked the extravagant privileges, immunities, and exemptions claimed by the proud churchmen of the age. He had insisted that bishops and abbots should pay scutage for the war of Toulouse like the lay barons; a measure which had drawn down upon him bitter invectives from the clergy. He had even told the prelates that they were bound to the king by the same oath as the barons: by the oath to preserve him in life, limb, dignity and honour. This was striking at the root of the independence of the Church above thrones and dominions: a doctrine then stoutly maintained by the clergy. All this excited the bitterest enmity of the churchmen: he was accused of seeking the ruin of the Church, and was even threatened with excommunication. But Henry placed him above their ban. Who was so fitting to be the primate of all England as the man who had so powerfully resisted ecclesiastical domination, and humbled both prelates and nobles in his zeal for Henry's greatness? Such a man would certainly be of the greatest service in a project contemplated by him in common with other European sovereigns: that of checking the growing power of Rome, and abolishing some of the more dangerous privileges of the clergy. It is true his conduct had not been that of a priest, although he belonged to the priestly order. He had been fonder of the sword than of preaching and praying, and had lived a life of pleasure rather than sanctity. He had preferred pomp and magnificence before humility; and a scarlet cloak lined with ermine to sombre canonicals. Hunting and hawking and the sports of the field had been infinitely more delightful to him than visiting the sick and the dying. All this, and more, indicating the man of the world rather than the priest, had been exhibited in his character. But then he might change in these particulars, and if not—if he, as chancellor, had done Henry so much good service in checking the

he ecclesiastics, who were ever ready to
ing's authority, how much greater service
not render him as the head of the Church
1! So Henry—although warned that his
ister might, as a consecrated archbishop,
formidable opponent—sent Becket from
to receive the primacy, to which he was
l in June, A.D. 1162.

w occurred one of the most remarkable
at ever marked the history of an individual.
took another form—clothing itself in the
mility. Becket was no longer desirous of
court or in the field of battle, but in the
The statesman and soldier—the courtier and
—the man of the world and the man of pleas-
me a rigid and ascetic monk. He denuded
all his princely magnificence. His old
s and gorgeously apparelled retainers were
his gay attire was cast off; and his choice
upbearers discharged. He now surrounded
th monks and beggars whose feet he daily
th his own hand; he clothed himself in
he ate the coarsest food and drank water
bitter by unsavoury herbs. And then his
how deep it seemed, and his prayers, how
ey were! His works of charity, also, in
nd pest-houses, how numerous and munifi-
this seeming sanctity soon caused Thomas
be revered as a saint, and the people loved
him with their prayers and acclamations.
all this show of humility Becket was am-
nd his ambition took that very form of
ry little dreamt when he raised him to the
that of exalting the power of the Church
uthority of the king. Was there ever such
phosis?

reformation of manner, however, was a
rely in externals. He retained his pride,
s, subtlety, and love of power. To some
may be attributed to a sense of what was
high office; but as it occurred not when the
as in abeyance, but when it was secure, it
ave been dictated by policy, and intended
in the anticipation of a contest with the
And that contest soon commenced. The
irst step was to resign the chancellorship:
imation that the rights of the Crown were
, in his esteem, subordinate to the interests
re. Henry himself seems to have so under-
or, on his return to England in January, A.D.
a Becket met him at Southampton, he met
l and formal reception. A collision sooner
as inevitable. It was brought about by
mself. In the year 1164 he went, with
other dignitaries of the Church, to a great
ld at Tours, at which Pope Alexander and
als were present. At this council it was
l that a severe canon should be made against
who held possessions which had once be-
the Church. Accordingly, on his return,
nanded from several barons, and from the
alf, the restoration of castles and manors
the time of William the Conqueror, had
the see of Canterbury. Thus of the king
led the castle of Rochester; of the Earl of
Clare the castle and barony of Tunbridge; and from other barons similar possessions. This aroused Henry's indignation; but when Becket excommunicated William de Eynsford, a military tenant of the Crown, for ejecting a priest collated to the rectory of that manor, his indignation knew no bounds. Henry had laid it down as a rule of government that no military vassal should be excommunicated without his consent, and he ordered Becket to reverse the sentence. It was not for the king, he proudly replied, to inform him whom he should absolve and whom excommunicate: that right and faculty belonged solely to the Church. But Henry would not yield. He threatened vengeance if his order was not obeyed; and this time Becket bent before the storm: the knight was absolved.

The primate had attacked the Crown; it was Henry's turn now to attack the Church. At this time the barbarous violence of the early days of feudal tenure was rapidly passing away. The old Saxon principle of compensation for crime had, to a considerable extent, been superseded by criminal laws, which were administered under the royal authority, and often with stern severity. A nearer approach to trial by jury was about to be attained, but the Church opposed such a mode of trial. Exemption was claimed by the clergy from all secular jurisdiction. If a murderer or robber, being a layman, was convicted in the courts of the Crown, he was punished with death; but the vilest offender, if he belonged to the clerical order, escaped such a penalty: *he* might expiate his crime by the time-honoured system of pecuniary compensation. And these clerical offenders were numerous. Many of the clergy in the retinues of the prelates and the abbots combined the priest with the soldier; for they served at the altar and performed the services of knights. In the days of King Stephen they had been protectors of religious houses against the marauding lay barons; and they had also been robbers and cut-throats. Nor were they much better in the first years of Henry Plantagenet's reign. Numerous homicides had been committed by them, and yet the offenders escaped punishment. It was, therefore, just that this turbulent order of priesthood should be brought under the control of the secular power. Henry resolved upon this reformation in the laws of his kingdom. A priest of Worcestershire had murdered a father that he might live undisturbed in a guilty intercourse with his daughter, and the offender was required to be delivered up for trial in the king's courts. Becket refused. He interposed the shield of the Church between the criminal and the outraged laws. He passed upon him a sentence of degradation, and then contended that he could not be tried a second time for the same offence. Enraged at such a proceeding, Henry called an assembly of prelates at Westminster, and demanded their assent to his project for subjecting the clergy to the authority of the civil courts. His demand was rejected. Would they then, he asked, observe the ancient customs of the realm? The reply given was that they would observe them, "saving the privileges of their order." It was Becket that framed this bold reply; and it was in vain that some of his friends advised him to abandon this saving clause. If an angel

...rge him to abandon ...him' Becket's ...temporal appointments ...of the Crown: for ...of every one of them. ...his projected reform. He ...a priest. In January, ...council at Clarendon, near ...of enactments, embodying ...insisted upon by the king, were ...sternly opposed them for three ...manned by the king and his nobles, ...supported by the prelates present, he ...enactments were carried, and Becket ...gn them: but after all, he refused to ... "The Constitutions of Clarendon," and ...that he afterwards subjected himself to ...ance for having acted contrary to the dic... conscience.

"Constitutions" were sent to Pope Alexander for ..., but, with the exception of six minor ..., he rejected them. Becket now became ...than ever in his opposition to the king. With ...pope on his side, he hoped yet to subdue the ...ill will of Henry. The pope was the only supe... he acknowledged in the world, and he was ...determined to obey him, and *him* alone. Twice he ...endeavoured to leave the kingdom, but was inter...cepted; and then he went back to his see, and com...menced a course of determined hostility that appeared to shut out all hope of a compromise. He acted in such direct opposition to the statute he had consented to pass, that Henry assembled a great council at Northampton, and summoned the proud churchman to appear before him. Becket was arraigned as a traitor, as having been guilty of a breach of allegiance and acts of contempt towards his sovereign. It was evident that the king was bent on his ruin. He was mulcted in a fine of five hundred pounds, required to refund monies which he had received as warden of Eye and Berkhampstead, and which the king had lent him before the walls of Toulouse; and finally was called upon to render an account of all receipts received by him from vacant bishoprics and abbeys during his chancellorship. It is said that Becket once thought of going barefoot to the palace to throw himself at the feet of Henry, and appeal to his pity and the remembrance of their ancient friendship; but if he ever had such a thought it soon passed away. Becket yield to the king? His proud spirit spurned the thought; he would not yield. He resolved to deny the authority of the court and brave the wrath of the king. The heroic attitude he displayed is marvellous, and well illustrates the character of his order at that period. On the morning of the day when he was called upon to submit to the decision of the king and his council, he preached from the text, "Princes also did sit and speak against me!" The service ended, he mounted his horse, wearing the pontifical robes, and bearing in his hands the archiepiscopal cross. Thus arrayed he reached the king's palace and presented himself before him in the hall. Enraged at his pompous manner, Henry withdrew into an inner apartment, the prelates and barons following him. Becket was left in the hall with only some of the inferior clergy. But he had not t long. Terrified at Henry's rage, the Bishop of entered the hall, and throwing himself at Becket implored him to have pity on himself and his br Henry had sworn "by God's eyes"—his usual that he would slay the first bishop who should a to excuse the conduct of the bold primate. then," exclaimed Becket, "if thou fearest: thou not understand the things that are of God." came out all the bishops, not to implore, but nounce their obedience to their primate. H sworn fealty, they said, to obey the "Constitu and had then resisted them and broken his fealt they would not obey a perjured archbishop. " what ye say," was his only reply. Sentence of im ment was then pronounced against him, and th of Leicester appeared in the hall to read his se "The king," said Leicester, "commands you t immediately and give in your accounts; if no your sentence." "My sentence," exclaimed I starting to his feet, "son and earl hear me first. I accepted my present charge I was declared fre all secular claims whatsoever. Therefore I will give any account. Besides, my son, neither l reason permits sons to judge their father. I d the jurisdiction of the king and barons, and ap God and my lord the Pope. I put myself a church of Canterbury under their protection, a part hence." As he strode slowly and proudly t the door of the hall the word "traitor" soun his ears, and the ancient spirit of the warri aroused at the insult. Looking round upo accusers scornfully, he exclaimed, "If my holy did not forbid it, I would make answer wi sword." Then remounting his horse, amidst the mations of the lower clergy and the common he rode in triumph to his lodgings, the people ing, "Blessed be God who hath delivered his s from the hands of his enemies!"

That night Becket gave a great feast at his lod But it was not to bishops, or abbots, or nobles had not only forsaken him, but had aided King in his resolve to crush his haughty spirit and his ruin. His guests that night were all the p and wayfarers his servants could collect in the Northampton and the adjacent highways to co feast with him and make "merry together Lord." Becket supped with them, and the h the chambers were filled with guests, and "they served with meat and drink to the full." In the of all this strange feasting and merriment, howev heart of the host was full to the brim of anxie fears for his liberty and life. If his guests were he was sad. It is strange, indeed, that in such ment of peril he should have made a feast eit the rich or to the poor. He must have know Henry was a king not to be trifled with ir matters. In truth he had been instrumental in ing the stern character of his sovereign. That know all this is clear, for during the evening spatched a messenger to ask Henry's leave to beyond the seas. The answer was that he have a reply in the morning. This was ominou Becket understood it; for in the dead of the ni left Northampton in the garb of a monk, wit

two attendants, and made his way towards the sea-coast, hiding by day and pursuing his journey by night. His escape was doubtful; for Henry had given orders that all seaports should be watched, and after fifteen days' sore travel he embarked in a small fishing-boat at Sandwich, and was finally set safe on shore on the Continent, near Gravelines. Friar Christian—for that was the name the primate assumed—encountered some adventures in Flanders; but he reached France, where, through the influence of Pope Alexander, whom he met at Sens, he became established in the Abbey of Pontigny, in Burgundy. Alexander supported his cause as that of truth, justice, and the Church; and Becket, thus favoured, declared, impiously, that Christ was again tried in his cause before a lay tribunal, and in his person "crucified afresh."

Anticipating that Becket might find friends and supporters in the pope and the king of France, Henry, on the advice of his prelates and barons, endeavoured to prevent such a consummation. An embassy, consisting of five bishops and several barons of the highest order, was sent to Rome to prosecute the archbishop, and if possible to procure his deposition. A large sum of gold, that most prevailing advocate in the papal court, was placed at disposal of the embassy for that purpose. The ambassadors also arrived with their letters to the Earl of Flanders and the Flemish king, entreating them not to afford the fugitive prelate an asylum in their dominions. They first tried the French monarch who was then at Compiegne. Henry's letter was presented to him; and Louis, who was a bigot and an admirer of Becket, pretended to be shocked when he read an expression which occurred in it, namely, "Thomas, late archbishop of Canterbury." "Late archbishop!" he exclaimed; "who hath deposed him? I am king as well as Henry of England, and yet I have no power to depose the meanest clerk in my dominions." Louis rejected the requisitions of the ambassadors, and asserted that he would protect the fugitive prelate with all his power. Thus unsuccessful in their mission, the embassy repaired to the pope, who was then at Sens. But it was to no purpose. Neither their representations nor their gold, in this instance, had any effect in the papal court. Alexander did not, indeed, distinctly state that he would support Becket in his quarrel with King Henry, but he could not, he said, give them an answer till the archbishop had been heard; and as Henry had defined the time they were to spend in their mission, they returned without accomplishing its object. As we have seen, Becket—who followed the English embassy to Compiegne, and from Compiegne to Sens—was more successful, for both Louis and the pope took up his cause without reserve; both hoping to make capital out of his quarrel with his sovereign.

But Henry was not to be trifled with. Having received the report of his embassy he revenged himself, not only on Becket, but on Pope Alexander. There were no more Peter's pence to be paid in England, and whoever of the clergy presumed to appeal to the pope, was doomed to imprisonment. But his heaviest vengeance fell on Thomas à-Becket. Writs were issued to the sheriffs of England, commanding them to seize all his goods and possessions within their jurisdiction, and to detain all bearers of appeals to the pope till his pleasure should be known. They were also to arrest all bearers of papers, whether from the pope or Becket, that purported to pronounce an interdict on the realm, as well as all clerks who should attempt to leave the kingdom without a passport. Henry's vengeance extended even to the friends of Thomas à-Becket, thereby wounding him in his dearest affections. The revenues of every clergyman who followed him into France, or aided him in any way, were seized by the crown; and without either reason or justice he banished all those who were connected with the exiled prelate, either by ties of blood or affection—this hard sentence being even extended to their wives and children. It is recorded that not less than four hundred were thus exiled; and that they were bound by oath to show themselves in their misery to the cause of their ruin, that his heart might be wrung by their sufferings. But this tyranny had the contrary effect of that which Henry desired, for it excited universal compassion towards Becket and his exiled friends in France and throughout the Continent, so that all their wants were bountifully supplied.

During this quarrel with Becket or the Church, the Welsh had once more taken up arms. Predatory incursions were made by them into England, A.D. 1163; and though they were driven back by an Anglo-Norman army, which subsequently retaliated by laying waste the county of Caermarthen, they reappeared, both from the north and south, and captured many castles. Their incursions were pushed forward into the level country; and, in A.D. 1165, Henry led an army against them in person. A battle was fought on the banks of the Cieroc, and the Welsh, being defeated, fled to the uplands. Henry pursued them as far as the Berwin; but as he was encamped beneath that mountain, a sudden storm of rain swelled the streams and deluged the valley, and the Welsh descending from its ridges, Henry's army was routed with great slaughter. On this occasion Henry took an unwonted revenge. Seven years before, hostages had been placed in his hands by the Welsh princes, as pledges for their allegiance; and, embittered by his defeat, he barbarously caused the eyes of the males to be picked out, and the noses and ears of the females to be cut off: a deed which must ever remain a stain on his memory.

Before his campaign against the Welsh, Henry had repaired to the Continent, where, at Gizors, he had an interview with the King of France on the affairs of Becket. As, however, he insisted on the submission of the archbishop to the Constitutions of Clarendon, and Louis refused to withdraw his protection from him, nothing was concluded. It was on his return that he went into Wales. After his defeat in that country, he spent his winter in England; but in the spring of A.D. 1166 he again repaired to the Continent. His presence was needed in Brittany. Henry was bound by treaty to support the cause of its duke, Conan, and at this time, incited by his cruelties, his barons had taken up arms against him. The Bretons hailed Henry as their deliverer, and Conan resigned his authority to him. Henry's third son, Geoffrey, and Conan's heiress, Constantia, had been betrothed by the treaty which bound Henry to support the cause of the Duke of Brittany, and, though still mere children, their espousals were now solemnized, and Henry under-

took the government of the duchy during his son's minority. But the fiery Breton nobles were not easily governed. Although they had affected to hail Henry as their deliverer, aided by the King of France and the people of Maine they again broke out into insurrection. A war ensued in which Henry was victorious. Most of the castles of the refractory barons were levelled to the ground. His victory proved a blessing to Brittany, for by it tranquillity, regular courts of law, and prosperity were established in that hitherto turbulent country. He spent the winter in his castle on Mount St. Michael, where he was visited by William, surnamed the Lion, who had recently mounted the throne of Scotland; and while he was on the Continent he imposed a tax of twopence in the pound on all his subjects, both English and foreign, for the support of the war in Palestine, which at this time was unfavourable in its results to the crusaders.

The battle of the crown and the crozier was not yet over. Becket was at this time less subdued than even in the early days of this great contest. The chroniclers relate that in his retreat, in the abbey of Pontigny, he spent his time in devotional exercises and assisting the monks in their local labours; but these were not his only occupations. In this interval he wrote many letters to different persons in England, in which he reproached some for their apostacy from, and praised others for their adherence to, "the cause of God." Pope Alexander also employed his pen in his favour; for he too wrote letters to England, commanding certain of Henry's subjects to espouse the cause of Becket. Supported by the pope, the archbishop grew bolder and bolder. He asked permission of the pontiff to excommunicate King Henry; but cautious policy led Alexander to advise forbearance in this respect. At the same time he permitted him to do what he pleased with Henry's subjects. Accordingly in the year 1166, Becket proceeded from Pontigny to Vezelay, near Auxerre, where, on the festival of the Ascension, he mounted the pulpit, and with "bell, book and candle," he solemnly cursed and pronounced excommunication against all the defenders of the Constitutions of Clarendon; the detainers of the sequestrated property of the see of Canterbury; and all who persecuted on his account either laymen or clergy. Some were personally named: as Richard de Lacy, chief justiciary, John of Oxford, Joycelin Baliol, Ralph de Broc, Hugh St. Clare, and Thomas FitzBernard: some for having promoted the Constitutions of Clarendon, and others for holding possession of the revenues of the see of Canterbury. Henry was called upon by name to repent and atone for the injuries he had done to the Church, otherwise he was to be placed under the archbishop's ban. He was to be cursed as those already denounced as evil-doers: to whom the heavens should be as brass, and the earth as iron; whose goings out and comings in, whose sleeping and whose waking, should be equally accursed; who should be visited with hunger, cold, sickness, and blindness: whom none would compassionate, and the very prayers for whom would be turned into curses. As Becket ceased his malediction, priests who stood around him with lighted torches extinguished them;" even as the souls of those delivered to perdition should be quenched in eternal darkness.

Henry is represented as being mad with rage when he heard of Becket's fierce anathemas. He was surrounded, he said, by traitors who would not deliver him from the insupportable vexations caused by th one man—a man who sought his ruin both body and soul. He gnashed his teeth with rage, and rolled about upon his bed of rushes and straw as one bereft of reason. When his paroxysm was over, he called council of his barons and prelates, at Chinon in Touraine, to take measures for revenge. Those measures were soon adopted. He threatened that if Becket should be still harboured in a Cistercian monastery he would confiscate all the estates of the Cistercians throughout his dominions. This threat had its effect: Becket removed out of Burgundy to the town of Sens, where a new asylum was provided for him by the King of France.

At that time, A.D. 1167, a petty war was proceeding between Louis and King Henry; and Louis made Becket an instrument of annoyance to the English monarch. Towers and castles were captured on both sides, and then in August there was a truce. The war was renewed, A.D. 1168, but it was brief, and more inglorious to the French monarch. In January, A.D. 1169, indeed, Louis was compelled to conclude a peace. Henry's three sons did homage to the French King for their continental dominions: Henry for Anjou and Maine, as he had formerly done for Normandy; Richard for Aquitaine; and Geoffrey for Brittany. It was also agreed that Richard should be united in marriage with Alice, a daughter of Louis, as Henry had already been with her sister Margaret.

This peace was followed by a hollow reconciliation between Henry and Thomas à-Becket. The pope's legates had previously attempted to bring about a reconciliation, but had failed: Becket's pride proving an insurmountable obstacle. He would admit of no concessions without certain reservations; such as "saving the honour of God and his Church;" and of "his own person." His obstinacy had the effect of turning his own order against him. Even the pope began to side with King Henry. At all events, as he had refused the mediation of the legates who had been especially accredited to mediate between him and his sovereign, Alexander took Henry and his kingdom under his special protection—strictly prohibiting him to inflict any censure on them, which he was still desirous of doing. Becket was enraged at this prohibition, and accused the legates of being bribed by Henry; and it is probable that his accusation was founded in truth. It seems likely too that the pope himself had received some English gold, for he provided Henry with a bull in A.D. 1168, which suspended the archbishop's spiritual authority over him and his subjects till he had been restored to favour. Becket was shorn of power; and in his retirement he was tormented with mortified pride and impotent resentment. There was, however, still a general desire to bring about a reconciliation between the monarch and the prelate. To that end, when the kings of England and France concluded a treaty of peace, as before recorded, in January, A.D. 1169, Becket was brought from his retirement to make his submission to the king. Louis, and all the princes and prelates present, urged him to make it in the most humble and

respectful manner, and having given a half promise to that effect, King Henry and his once bosom companion again stood face to face. But Becket did not make the submission required of him. He fell down upon his knees and said, "I submit myself to the mercy of God and the king, to the honour of God and the king;" but this ambiguous form of words did not satisfy Henry. He was to say in plain words that "he would obey those laws and customs which the holy archbishops of Canterbury had obeyed in the times of former kings, and which he had sworn solemnly to obey." To this Becket finally consented; but he would add this reservation, "saving the honour of God and his Church." But Henry knew full well that whatever displeased Becket he would interpret as contrary to the honour of God and the rights of his order, and he would not admit of such a saving clause. There was to be no mental reservation: the submission was to be made in the words dictated or not at all. But it was in vain that the King of France and those around him urged Becket to accept peace on the conditions offered: he adhered with inflexible obstinacy to his "savings." Many of the nobles, as Becket retired from the conference unreconciled, were indignant at his intolerable pride, and even Louis himself felt ashamed of his conduct; but still, efforts were made to bring about the reconciliation. It is probable that the bull, with which the pope had provided King Henry, had made him more inflexible than he would have been; and to counteract this he was now furnished with another which set forth that if he was not reconciled before Lent with the archbishop he, the pontiff, would restore him to the full exercise of his spiritual authority over him and his kingdom! This was delivered to Henry at a second interview between him and King Louis on the subject; and aware of the use Becket would make of that authority, if it was restored, he said that he would permit the archbishop to return to England if he would only promise to behave towards him as former primates had behaved towards former kings. But Becket, when consulted, would not even do this without adding his saving clause, "the rights of his order." Mediation was still in vain, and both parties became more exasperated than ever. Becket denounced Henry as a more cruel tyrant and persecutor than Herod; and as Lent commenced he resumed the exercise of his spiritual authority—again launching the thunders of excommunication against all those in England who opposed his views and held his possessions, both among the clergy and the laity. Meanwhile, Henry was not idle. Ambassadors were sent to the pope at Beneventura, to persuade him to bring about peace by translating Becket from Canterbury to some other see: offering him as a reward for this good service ten thousand marks, and the privilege of not only filling up the vacant see but all others then vacant in England. Contrary, no doubt, to Henry's expectations and former experience these tempting offers were rejected. Alexander would send two nuncios into Normandy to negotiate a peace; but the ambassadors could not obtain anything beyond this promise. These nuncios were sent, and they returned without affecting the object of their mission. With the thunders of excommunication hanging over his head, Henry would not give up his point of an unreserved submission from the haughty prelate. Dreading—as there was cause to do in that dark age—the effect of his being personally excommunicated, and of his kingdom being laid under an interdict, Henry sent over instructions to England that all intercourse between his subjects and the pope or Becket was to cease; and also that it would be deemed high treason for any one to bring an interdict from either of them into England, or to pay any obedience to any such interdict. Whoever, in a word, in any way favoured the pope or the archbishop was to suffer the forfeiture of not only their own possessions, but those of all their kindred. At the same time, while acting thus boldly, Henry deemed it politic to conciliate the papal court. Instructions were sent to his agents to use their utmost endeavours to bring about terms of accommodation; and whether the pontiff was awed by Henry's bold proceeding, or tempted with his gold, cannot be distinctly stated, but it is certain they were now more successful in their efforts. Having promised, in the king's name, that Becket should be permitted to return to his church in safety, and hold it in peace, and that all who had been exiled on his account should be restored to their possessions, the Archbishop of Rouen and Bishop of Nevers were commissioned to settle the long-pending dispute on that basis. Henry had sworn that he would never give Becket "the kiss of peace," and these prelates were directed to absolve him from that oath, and if he still adhered to it to persuade Becket to accept it of Prince Henry. They were also authorized to absolve all those whom Becket had excommunicated. At this time, also, Henry's agents obtained a bull from the pope empowering Roger, archbishop of York, to crown Prince Henry. The right of consecration, undoubtedly in England, belonged to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and Becket was enraged to madness when he heard of the success of Henry's agents at the papal court: he accused the pope and the cardinals of being bribed, and of "absolving the devil and crucifying Christ."

This remarkable contest was not ended when, in March, A.D. 1170, Henry sailed to England to carry out his design of crowning his son into execution. At this period the ceremonies of coronation and the royal unction were deemed of the highest importance by the monarchs both of England and France, and it was their desire to see their sons crowned while they lived, in order that they might have a comfortable assurance that their succession would be secured. Hence it was that Henry, by skilful diplomacy, obtained a bull from the pope to have his son crowned by other hands than those of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Prince Henry was crowned and and anointed king in London, on the 4th of June, and the day after the prelates and barons assembled on the occasion, including William, king of Scotland, and David his brother, and swore fealty to the young king, with a saving of the fealty they owed to his father. This desire of his heart accomplished, Henry returned to Normandy, leaving the young king regent of England.

It was on his return to Normandy that the pope's nuncio effected the reconciliation, on the basis of the terms agreed upon, between King Henry and Thomas à-Becket. It was in July that the final conference

took place; and the meeting was in a pleasant meadow near Touraine. There was a large assembly of prelates and nobles, both French and English, to witness the compact between the sovereign and the primate. Henry arrived at the place of meeting before the archbishop, and as soon as Becket appeared he rode towards him, and saluted him cap in hand. They held a long discourse together apart: Becket, according to his own account, bitterly complaining of the wrongs he had endured, and Henry, being all smiles and condescension, promising that ample reparation should be made him. To all appearance they were reconciled; for on their joining the assembly, Henry said that he found the bishop in the best possible disposition, and that it would, therefore, be sinful in him to nourish hatred any longer. The forms of reconciliation were completed; but Henry would not give the sign and seal of a perfect reconciliation—the coveted "kiss of peace." He would give him that, he said, when he again met him in England. Henry, however, held Becket's stirrups when he mounted his horse, which was a token of honour if not of affection. Still, they parted without that token of perfect amity, which, in the feudal ages, had a peculiar solemnity when received from the lips of a king—"the kiss of peace."

Henry, however, appears to have been desirous of preserving the peace with the haughty churchman. He had suffered much from the quarrel, and had no desire for its prolongation. It is true that he did not, as it is alleged, do as he promised, send money for his journey to England, but he kept faith with him in all essential matters. He had pleged himself by the compact at Touraine to restore him to his archbishopric, with all its lands, livings, and privileges, and having made his peace with Becket, he sent a letter to his son, the regent, to this effect:—"Know you that Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, has made my peace agreeable to my desire; and, therefore, I require that he and all of his following should have peace: and you will take care that the said archbishop, and that all of his people who went out of England, should have their possessions truly, and honourably, and in peace, as they had them three months before the said archbishop went out of England." It is clear, therefore, that Henry still held out the olive-branch to Becket. Had he acted to others as the king was acting towards him, it might have been well for him when he was restored to his primacy. But he acted far otherwise. The Archbishop of York, assisted by the Bishops of London and Salisbury, had performed the ceremony of crowning Prince Henry in defiance of his rights as primate, and he could not forgive them. At their last conference Henry had appeased Becket on that score, but it was only for a moment; for before he embarked for England he sent letters of excommunication against them: a deed which had as much or more to do with the final catastrophe than Henry's outburst of passion. It was a palpable indication that, on his part, there was to be no oblivion of the past, and no peace for the future. With these feelings he sailed from France. He landed at Sandwich on the 1st of December, and from thence proceeded to Canterbury. Henry sent protectors with him, among whom was John of Oxford, one of the royal chaplains, whom, on a former occasion, he excommunicated. Whether Becket had become r ciled to John of Oxford may be doubtful, and it appear singular that Henry should have chosen for one of his escort. But if he was not the prin friend, John proved a faithful protector, fo shielded him from some armed men who, on landing, commanded him in a threatening ton absolve the excommunicated bishops. With thi ception, however, the primate was unmolested, an entered Canterbury in triumph; for the prior an

WEST GATE, CANTERBURY.

burgesses flocked to meet him and give him a he welcome. But it was not so with the nobles and ecclesiastics: they, as a body, stood aloof from Even Prince Henry, his former pupil, who wa Woodstock, shunned him; for when, a few days his arrival at Canterbury, he set out for Woodsto pay the prince a visit, he was met by a messenger forbade him, in the young king's name, to pro any further; he was to return to and remain wi his own diocese. On his homeward route he s some days at Harrow-on-the-Hill, where he exer great hospitality: his guests being of the same as those he had entertained at Northampton. only ecclesiastic mentioned as having visited him the abbot of St. Albans. As for the vicar and r of Harrow, they treated him with the grossest d spect, for, it is said, that when he left Harrow maimed the horse which carried his provisions offence for which they were afterwards excom nicated.

Becket returned to Canterbury escorted by a of poor people, armed with rusty targets and lanc protect him. Whatever feelings King Henry entertained towards him, it is clear that there but few persons of rank, either among churchm laymen, who were not his inveterate enemies. was himself convinced of this, and foresaw that vengeance would encompass his death. "I com die amongst you" was the text from which he prea on Christmas-day. It is said that his sermon wa eloquent discourse, but it was marred with wor fiery vengeance. Having told the people that o the archbishops had been a martyr, and that



MURDER OF THOMAS À BECKET.

would probably soon see another, he exclaimed, "But before I depart, I will avenge some of the wrongs my Church has suffered during the last seven years." And then it was that he excommunicated the vicar and rector of Harrow for maiming his sumpter horse, adding another to the number of the doomed, Ranulf de Broc, one of his most inveterate enemies. This was Becket's last recorded act.

The prelates whom Becket had excommunicated had repaired to Normandy to demand redress from King Henry. They implored it both for the sake of royalty and the Church: for his sake as well as their own. It was not likely that Henry would hear them patiently, or would quietly submit to the domination of the imperious man who had so wantonly renewed their old quarrel. He had offered Becket the olive-branch, and he had imperiously trampled it under his feet. Henry was seized with one of his most violent fits of fury, in the midst of which he demanded if there was no one around him who would deliver him from this turbulent priest? That demand was sufficient. Interpreting it as Becket's death-warrant, four knights present—William de Tracy, Hugh de Morville, Richard Brito, and Reginald FitzUrse—all men of note, without communicating their intentions, sailed for England. They were certainly not commissioned to commit the deed they contemplated; for, after Henry's wrath had subsided, he held a council of barons, in which it was resolved that three commissioners should go to England and arrest Thomas à-Becket, according to the forms of law, on a charge of high treason. These commissioners were appointed and sent to England; but the four knights had a long start of them. They arrived three days after Christmas at Saltwood, near Canterbury, where the De Broc family had a residence, and where they arranged their plans. There were others ready and willing to join them in their fearful work. That work was speedily accomplished. On the 29th of December these four knights, with twelve others, resorted to the archbishop's palace. They entered his chamber, and took their seats in moody silence. Becket first spoke: he wished to know what they wanted? FitzUrse replied that they had come from the king to demand that he should absolve the excommunicated bishops, and that he should re-establish those whom he had suspended. The excommunication of the Archbishop of York was considered to have been an attempt to dethrone the young King Henry, and, therefore, it was demanded that he should go to him at Winchester to make satisfaction to him; in other words, he was called upon to answer for his offences against the king. Imperious as ever, Becket refused, accompanying his refusal with taunts and bitter invectives. "Of whom do you hold your archbishopric?" demanded Reginald; "of the the king or the pope?" "My spiritual rights I owe to God and the pope," replied Becket: "my temporal rights to the king." "Is it not the king that hath given you all?" rejoined Reginald. Becket's answer in the negative was received with murmurs and threats. Three of the knights had followed Becket in his wars on the Continent; and when he reminded them of this, and observed that it was not for such to threaten him in his own house, they replied that they would do more than threaten, and they departed.

Becket was blamed by his attendants for inflaming the fury of his enemies by the rough manner with which he had treated them, and they urged him to make his escape. "I know what I ought to do," was his reply. That evening he went to vespers in the cathedral. Meanwhile, the knights with their accomplices had put on their coats-of-mail, and armed themselves with sword and battle-axe. Thus arrayed, they returned to the palace. Becket, followed by the monks, was then passing along with solemn tread through the conventual buildings into the cloister. The gate of the palace had been shut and barred by the terrified servants, and it was in vain that the knights thundered at it for admittance. Ingress, however, was found by a window, and on they went after the monks into the church. All fled except Becket and his cross-bearer, Gryme. Becket stood erect before the altar. It was dark, and the obscurity

THOMAS A-BECKET'S CHAPEL.

of the church was only broken here and there by the faint light of a lamp. "Where is the traitor?" inquired Tracy. There was no answer. "Where is the archbishop?" "Here am I, but no traitor," replied Becket; "ready to suffer in my Saviour's name." "Thou art a prisoner," said Tracy; but Becket, as Tracy laid hands on him, shook him off with violence. It is said that the knights advised him either to flee or to go with them, but he refused to do either, and still used offensive language to them. Other writers, however, of the age represent Becket as acting like an angel of meekness. From his known character it is probable that he did use provoking language. Still his assailants paused before they struck the fatal blow. Again they demanded the absolution of the bishops. "Never, till they have offered satisfaction," was the reply. "Then, die!" exclaimed FitzUrse, and as his sword was descending upon his head, his cross-bearer received the blow upon his arm. Becket's head was slightly wounded, and again he was called upon to flee. But Becket moved not, and then a second blow

return thither a similar tax was levied from his military tenants in that country, and he then collected a large army of adventurers, or soldiers of fortune, for his enterprise. In the meantime, Raymond had made preparations for resistance; and Louis, king of France, whose hostility was aroused by Henry's pretensions to Toulouse, had marched with an army to Raymond's assistance. Henry's boldest adviser in this war was Thomas à-Becket. Henry's army consisted chiefly of the famous infantry of the Low Countries; but in his train were Malcolm, king of Scotland, Raymond, king of Arragon—to whose infant daughter Henry had affianced his son Richard—one of the Welsh princes, and some English and foreign princes. Thomas-à-Becket, chancellor of England, the inseparable companion of his master, was also there, "and none went thither in more warlike guise." Becket marched at the head of seven hundred knights, equipped and maintained at his own expense, and at the capture of Cahors, which was taken in their route to Toulouse, he mounted the deadly breach with his cavalry. At length Henry's army appeared before the city of Toulouse. The King of France was within its walls, and Becket advised Henry to take the city by assault, and make the French monarch prisoner. Henry rejected this bold advice. He had scruples about a direct attack on his feudal superior. It was considered by him not only to be inconsistent with his oath of fealty, but a dangerous example to set to his own vassals if he should make war upon the person of his liege lord. Henry, therefore, declared that out of respect to the king of France, he would not besiege Toulouse. A French army, moreover, came to the relief of the French king while Henry was encamped before the city, and Henry, leaving the supreme command to Becket, returned to Normandy. The clerical chancellor continued the war, and captured three castles in Languedoc, supposed to have been impregnable; but a French force having made a diversion on the side of Normandy, he rejoined the king, leaving only a few insignificant garrisons to preserve his conquests. But the war on the frontiers of Normandy was soon ended: the French king having been induced to treat, Becket was charged with the negotiations, which he conducted with his usual ability. A truce was concluded, which, in A.D. 1160, was converted into a formal peace. By that treaty Henry was permitted to retain the castles which had been captured in the earldom of Toulouse, and his eldest son did homage to Louis for the duchy of Normandy.

This peace, however, was of very short duration. Having lost his queen Constance, and having no male issue, Louis, king of France, after a widowhood of only twelve days, married Adelais, sister of the earls of Blois, Sancerre and Champagne. Alarmed in his turn at this increase of the French king's power, and his alliance with the inveterate enemies of his family, Henry prevailed upon the Pope's legate to celebrate the espousals between his son Henry, who was seven years of age, and Margaret, the daughter of Louis, then only three years of age, and when the ceremony was concluded, he demanded and obtained of the Knights Templars the infant's dower—the three castles in the Vexin. Enraged at this transaction, the French monarch banished the three Knights Templars who had held the castles in trust, and commenced hostilities against Henry. But the operations of this war were of small importance. Louis was no match for the powerful and politic Henry. A few lances were shivered, and two or three castles besieged; but neither of the kings were disposed to attack each other in person, and about Midsummer, A.D. 1161, peace was concluded.

Henry remained in Normandy till January, A.D. 1163, when he returned to England. Becket had returned before his master. The see of Canterbury had become vacant, A.D. 1161, by the death of the archbishop Theobald. During thirteen months Henry appropriated the revenues of the primacy to his own use. They were of service in his diplomacy and war. When, however, he had accomplished all he desired on the continent—at least for a time—he turned his thoughts to the filling up of the primacy. Many of the English bishops had sought the dignity, but Henry turned a deaf ear to their suits. There was one man among his subjects whom he delighted to honour above all others—his companion and friend, Thomas à-Becket. And he had good reason for this, inasmuch as Becket was devoted to his master's interests. He had been most diligent in his endeavours to humble the subject in order to exalt the king. In his capacity of chancellor he had not only greatly humbled the lay aristocracy but had attacked the extravagant privileges, immunities, and exemptions claimed by the proud churchmen of the age. He had insisted that bishops and abbots should pay scutage for the war of Toulouse like the lay barons; a measure which had drawn down upon him bitter invectives from the clergy. He had even told the prelates that they were bound to the king by the same oath as the barons: by the oath to preserve him in life, limb, dignity and honour. This was striking at the root of the independence of the Church above thrones and dominions: a doctrine then stoutly maintained by the clergy. All this excited the bitterest enmity of the churchmen: he was accused of seeking the ruin of the Church, and was even threatened with excommunication. But Henry placed him above their ban. Who was so fitting to be the primate of all England as the man who had so powerfully resisted ecclesiastical domination, and humbled both prelates and nobles in his zeal for Henry's greatness? Such a man would certainly be of the greatest service in a project contemplated by him in common with other European sovereigns: that of checking the growing power of Rome, and abolishing some of the more dangerous privileges of the clergy. It is true his conduct had not been that of a priest, although he belonged to the priestly order. He had been fonder of the sword than of preaching and praying, and had lived a life of pleasure rather than sanctity. He had preferred pomp and magnificence before humility; and a scarlet cloak lined with ermine to sombre canonicals. Hunting and hawking and the sports of the field had been infinitely more delightful to him than visiting the sick and the dying. All this, and more, indicating the man of the world rather than the priest, had been exhibited in his character. But then he might change in these particulars, and if not—if he, as chancellor, had done Henry so much good service in checking the

power of the ecclesiastics, who were ever ready to defy the king's authority, how much greater service might he not render him as the head of the Church in England! So Henry—although warned that his supple minister might, as a consecrated archbishop, become a formidable opponent—sent Becket from Normandy to receive the primacy, to which he was inaugurated in June, A.D. 1162.

And now occurred one of the most remarkable changes that ever marked the history of an individual. Ambition took another form—clothing itself in the guise of humility. Becket was no longer desirous of honour at court or in the field of battle, but in the Church. The statesman and soldier—the courtier and the hunter—the man of the world and the man of pleasure—became a rigid and ascetic monk. He denuded himself of all his princely magnificence. His old companions and gorgeously apparelled retainers were dismissed; his gay attire was cast off; and his choice cooks and cupbearers discharged. He now surrounded himself with monks and beggars whose feet he daily washed with his own hand; he clothed himself in sackcloth; he ate the coarsest food and drank water rendered bitter by unsavoury herbs. And then his penitence, how deep it seemed, and his prayers, how fervent they were! His works of charity, also, in hospitals and pest-houses, how numerous and munificent! All this seeming sanctity soon caused Thomas à-Becket to be revered as a saint, and the people loved to follow him with their prayers and acclamations. But with all this show of humility Becket was ambitious; and his ambition took that very form of which Henry little dreamt when he raised him to the primacy: that of exalting the power of the Church over the authority of the king. Was there ever such a metamorphosis?

Becket's reformation of manner, however, was a change merely in externals. He retained his pride, haughtiness, subtlety, and love of power. To some extent this may be attributed to a sense of what was due to his high office; but as it occurred not when the primacy was in abeyance, but when it was secure, it seems to have been dictated by policy, and intended for effect in the anticipation of a contest with the Crown. And that contest soon commenced. The primate's first step was to resign the chancellorship: a plain intimation that the rights of the Crown were henceforth, in his esteem, subordinate to the interests of the mitre. Henry himself seems to have so understood it; for, on his return to England in January, A.D. 1163, when Becket met him at Southampton, he met with a cold and formal reception. A collision sooner or later was inevitable. It was brought about by Becket himself. In the year 1164 he went, with most of the other dignitaries of the Church, to a great council held at Tours, at which Pope Alexander and his cardinals were present. At this council it was determined that a severe canon should be made against all those who held possessions which had once belonged to the Church. Accordingly, on his return, Becket demanded from several barons, and from the Crown itself, the restoration of castles and manors which, in the time of William the Conqueror, had belonged to the see of Canterbury. Thus of the king he demanded the castle of Rochester; of the Earl of Clare the castle and barony of Tunbridge; and from other barons similar possessions. This aroused Henry's indignation; but when Becket excommunicated William de Eynsford, a military tenant of the Crown, for ejecting a priest collated to the rectory of that manor, his indignation knew no bounds. Henry had laid it down as a rule of government that no military vassal should be excommunicated without his consent, and he ordered Becket to reverse the sentence. It was not for the king, he proudly replied, to inform him whom he should absolve and whom excommunicate: that right and faculty belonged solely to the Church. But Henry would not yield. He threatened vengeance if his order was not obeyed; and this time Becket bent before the storm: the knight was absolved.

The primate had attacked the Crown; it was Henry's turn now to attack the Church. At this time the barbarous violence of the early days of feudal tenure was rapidly passing away. The old Saxon principle of compensation for crime had, to a considerable extent, been superseded by criminal laws, which were administered under the royal authority, and often with stern severity. A nearer approach to trial by jury was about to be attained, but the Church opposed such a mode of trial. Exemption was claimed by the clergy from all secular jurisdiction. If a murderer or robber, being a layman, was convicted in the courts of the Crown, he was punished with death; but the vilest offender, if he belonged to the clerical order, escaped such a penalty: *he* might expiate his crime by the time-honoured system of pecuniary compensation. And these clerical offenders were numerous. Many of the clergy in the retinues of the prelates and the abbots combined the priest with the soldier; for they served at the altar and performed the services of knights. In the days of King Stephen they had been protectors of religious houses against the marauding lay barons; and they had also been robbers and cut-throats. Nor were they much better in the first years of Henry Plantagenet's reign. Numerous homicides had been committed by them, and yet the offenders escaped punishment. It was, therefore, just that this turbulent order of priesthood should be brought under the control of the secular power. Henry resolved upon this reformation in the laws of his kingdom. A priest of Worcestershire had murdered a father that he might live undisturbed in a guilty intercourse with his daughter, and the offender was required to be delivered up for trial in the king's courts. Becket refused. He interposed the shield of the Church between the criminal and the outraged laws. He passed upon him a sentence of degradation, and then contended that he could not be tried a second time for the same offence. Enraged at such a proceeding, Henry called an assembly of prelates at Westminster, and demanded their assent to his project for subjecting the clergy to the authority of the civil courts. His demand was rejected. Would they then, he asked, observe the ancient customs of the realm? The reply given was that they would observe them, "saving the privileges of their order." It was Becket that framed this bold reply; and it was in vain that some of his friends advised him to abandon this saving clause. If an angel

Saint Edmundsbury, sent over as a prisoner to Normandy.

At this time the old story of the king's guilt of the murder of Becket had been industriously spread in England by the conspirators, in order to alienate the affections of his people. And it was well calculated to have that effect. Becket was greater in his tomb than he had been in his palace of Canterbury. The Pope had placed his name among the most illustrious of the saints and martyrs, and the miracles said to have been worked at his shrine were now recognized both by the hierarchy and the lower clergy. As for the credulous multitude, they esteemed the dead primate as a saint and martyr of the highest order; and as a natural consequence held his murderers in the deepest execration. To make the people believe, therefore, that Henry was guilty of the "Saint's" death was a sure means of bringing down their vengeance upon his head. Whether it was to avert such a consummation, or whether Henry was a partaker in the superstitions of the age, certain it is that he took a step on his arrival at Southampton calculated to give the lie direct to the charge laid against him, and to revive the waning affections of many of his subjects. No sooner had he landed, than mounting his horse he rode towards Canterbury, without taking any other refreshment than bread and water. It was at the dawn of day that he came in sight of the towers of Canterbury cathedral, and though some miles distant he dismounted, threw off his royal garments and sandals, and walked the rest of the way over a stony road barefoot. He entered Canterbury with bleeding feet: was there ever such an edifying sight? A mighty monarch leaving marks of his blood at every step he took, wending his way to the shrine of the great native saint, Thomas à-Becket! The people of Canterbury were affected to tears at such an unwonted sight; and all England heard of it with admiration! Even if he had been guilty, surely this was sufficient to wipe away his guilt. But his humility did not end here. On arriving at the cathedral he descended into the crypt, and threw himself upon the grave of Becket, where he long remained with his face pressed to the cold earth, sobbing and weeping as though his kingly heart would burst with grief. As the people stood around him they were touched to the heart at such a spectacle: surely they were now convinced of the royal innocence! But if they were not, there was one in the pulpit who was, and who, while Henry was sobbing and weeping, was using all his powers of eloquence to convince them that their king was not guilty of shedding the blood of the holy martyr Becket. Gilbert Foliot, the once bishop of Hereford, but now bishop of London—the man who, when Becket was slain before the altar, had proposed that his dead carcase should be thrown into a ditch or hung high upon a gallows—was this preacher. He told the people that Henry, king of England, solemnly protested that he was not guilty; that he neither ordered, caused, nor desired the death of the glorious saint, and he conjured them to believe their king. At the same time, he said, as the murderers might have taken some advantage of his hasty words, King Henry had come to Canterbury to do penance for those words, and before the bishops there assembled was about to submit "his naked flesh to the rod of discipli preacher having ceased, Henry rose from walked into the chapter-house, where, havi off his upper garments, he again prostrat confessed to the minor offence, and then rec tisement for his offence. Each of the eighty e present gave him from three to five lashes: and abbots handling the knotted cord firs them the monks; and as each blow fell upo back these words were uttered—"Even as scourged for the sins of men, so be thou s thine own sin." It is clear from what fol the ecclesiastics had been very tender in tisement of the royal penitent; for no soo over than Henry again resorted to the again prostrated himself at Becket's tomb, said he spent the rest of the day and the w night in fasting, weeping, and prayer. T rise he heard mass, and having drunk some blessed by St. Becket himself, and being su a small bottle of it "for the good of hi mounted his horse, and rode "with a joyo London!"

If the knotted cords had not fallen Henry's naked body, excitement, fatigue, a told upon his frame. On arriving in Lond seized with a burning fever, which confin several days to his chamber. He arrived t 13th of July, a day distinguished by one o memorable events of his reign; a day on confederacy received a fatal blow. The ki land had invested Alnwick Castle; and himself secure, had sent the main body of h three different parties to plunder the countries. Receiving intelligence of this, Glanville, with four hundred knights, Newcastle, in the vicinity of the Scottish arrived at Newcastle on the 12th of July, a refreshed his men and horses, pushed on to camp at daybreak, under cover of a thick fo fog cleared away, Alnwick Castle was seen distance, and the king of the Scots, with abo knights, tilting in a meadow. William imagined that the armed troops approachin to his own subject, Duncan, earl of Fife. soon undeceived. Himself and his whole a brief conflict, were made captives. H aroused from his sleep at midnight to hear and, leaping from his bed, he wept for joy a all his friends to be called around him, a bells in London to be set a ringing to pr tidings. Previous to this, Richard De been successful in the centre of the kin Geoffrey, bishop elect of Lincoln, Henry's n by the fair Rosamond, had defeated Roger bray. Geoffrey had fought most gallantly Henry; and on hearing of his victory, his claimed that he was "his lawful son: the bastards." By these events the rebellion i was crushed. The Scotch army retired; barons made their submission; and the yo Henry and the earl of Flanders laid aside al of an invasion.

In the meantime the king of France had to Rouen, the capital of Normandy. He

joined by the young king and the earl of Flanders. Against these opponents King Henry led his army. That army was numerous, for the people of England flocked to his standard from all quarters. He had also with him his Brabancon mercenaries, and a thousand brave Welsh soldiers. He was soon in Normandy, carrying with him as prisoners the king of Scotland and the two great earls of Chester and Leicester. The two queens, Eleanor and Margaret, were left in safe custody in England. Rouen still held out, for its citizens were loyal, and several barons with their vassals defended its walls bravely. Henry landed at Harfleur, and marched with all haste to Rouen. He came, he saw, and conquered. In a brief period the confederates were not only obliged to raise the siege, but to retreat out of Normandy. Acting now under the advice of Louis, who had been the chief promoter of the confederacy, an armistice was requested, and a meeting for the general arrangement of peace. Henry and Geoffrey consented to this request being made; but Richard, supported by the turbulent barons of Aquitain, still persisted in war against his father. But it was in vain that he fought: in six weeks he had lost most of his castles, and he was compelled to ask his father's forgiveness, and to take part in the conference.

The conference, was held at a place between Tours and Amboise. The terms of the peace were dictated by Henry; and considering the provocation he had received, they were most merciful. His rebel sons having thrown themselves at his feet, implored his pardon, and acknowledged his authority as a parent and king, he assigned them appointments for their support. Henry was to have two castles in Normandy, and a yearly allowance of 15,000*l.*, Angevin money; Geoffrey two castles in Brittany, with half the estates that had belonged to his father-in-law elect, and a promise of the remainder when his marriage with Conan's daughter was consummated; and Richard two castles in Poitou, with half the revenues of that earldom. All the prisoners, except one, amounting to nearly one thousand knights, were freely set at liberty. The exception was the king of Scotland, who was confined for several months in the castle of Falaise; but he was finally liberated, after doing homage to Henry as his liege lord: it being stipulated that the Scottish clergy and barons should also take an oath of fealty to King Henry, and that certain castles in Scotland should be manned by English garrisons. By this degrading treaty, which appears to have been counselled by a deputation of Scottish prelates and nobles who waited on their king at Falaise, the independence of Scotland was nominally sacrificed, at least for a period. It was signed in December, A.D. 1174.

It is said that some differences again arose between Henry and the heir to his throne; but if so, they did not lead to any important consequences. They celebrated the festival of Easter together, A.D. 1175, at Cherbourg, after which they sailed in company to England. This was in May. After their landing, they appear to have lived in harmony: not only eating at the same table, but sleeping in the same bed, as if to convince the world of the cordiality of their reconciliation. Relieved from his anxieties, Henry directed his attention to the better administration of his English dominions. He was unremitting in the discharge of his civil duties: all his energies and resources being directed to the reform of the administration of his kingdom. During this interval of peace, Henry also, accompanied by his son, made several progresses to different parts of the kingdom, holding councils and receiving homage from princes and barons. In a progress to the north soon after their arrival in England, they were met by William, king of Scotland, with his prelates, barons, and freeholders, all of whom did homage, and swore fealty, first, to King Henry the father, and then to King Henry the son. Hostages had been given by the king of Scotland at Falaise, and these were now, set at liberty. On their return to Windsor, a great council was held, at which a treaty was concluded, by which the ambassadors of Roderic O'Connor, king of Connaught, agreed that O'Connor should hold his kingdom of the king of England, and pay him by way of tribute the tenth hide of all cattle killed in his dominions.

Although Henry and his son appeared to have lived in harmony, yet the young king seems not to have been happy in his father's company. He was treated with kindness, and carefully instructed in the arts of government, but he longed for more liberty. So grave a monitor as King Henry did not suit his disposition. Hence in the year 1176, after much entreaty, he obtained permission to pay a devotional visit to St. James of Compostella. That was the ostensible object of his desire to return to the Continent; but it was soon seen what his real object was. We do not read that he paid his devotions to St. James; but, on the contrary, he spent much of his time in the company of those who had been his confidants in his late revolt. In order, however, to prevent any further rebellion, on becoming aware of his son's suspicious conduct, Henry at this time demolished some of the castles of the barons with whom he thus associated, and took others into his own possession. But though he thus diminished the power of some of his barons who were of doubtful loyalty, Henry was not an arbitrary monarch. When he imagined it would be productive of good effect, he exercised a noble clemency. Thus in the year 1177, in a parliament held at Northampton, he pardoned the two potent earls of Chester and Leicester, who had been excepted out of the late pacification, and restored to them all their estates. In the same year, at another council held at Oxford, the princes and lords of Wales did homage to him for their territories and estates; and his youngest son, Prince John, was declared lord of Ireland, to be held by him and his heirs as a fief under the crown of England. The conquered provinces in that island was also distributed among such of his barons as he deemed most deserving, and most able to defend and enlarge those conquests. At this period Henry's fame for wisdom, judicial ability, and power extended over all Europe. Alfonso, king of Castile, and his uncle, Sancho, king of Navarre, had been for some years disputing about their territories, and had drawn the sword against each other; but they now referred their quarrel to the English monarch, binding themselves to submit to his award, which he adjudged in a council held at London, and in such a

manner that the ambassadors of Castile and Navarre expressed their entire satisfaction at its wisdom and justice.

Louis, king of France, however, was still the enemy of Henry, king of England. A dispute had again broken out between them; and in August Henry embarked at Portsmouth for Normandy, to settle it. The matter in dispute was this. It had been agreed, A.D. 1169, that Prince Richard should marry Adelais, the youngest daughter of Louis; and as both parties were marriageable, the French king insisted that the ceremony should be forthwith performed. Henry demurred, and the Pope threatened to lay his kingdom under an interdict if he did not allow it to be completed; but he settled the matter with Louis and the Pope by agreeing to take the cross and to go with the king of France on an expedition to the Holy Land: an engagement which, if ever really intended, was never fulfilled.

Henry spent the first six months of A.D. 1178 in Normandy in regulating the ecclesiastical affairs of his continental dominions; and on his return to England he employed his time in the same beneficent purposes. In the same year he knighted his third son Geoffrey with great solemnity at Woodstock; and Geoffrey soon after went to the Continent to display his valour and dexterity in tournaments, for which his brothers Henry and Richard were already renowned. Two years afterwards Henry himself returned to Normandy: this time to settle a dispute which had occurred among the members of the royal family of France. He nobly returned good for evil. Instead of fomenting discord, as Louis had done when his sons displayed a rebellious spirit, he laboured to restore peace. By his mediation the quarrel was allayed, and he returned to England A.D. 1181. It was in this year that he published his famous "assize of arms," which had for its object the security and defence of his dominions. By this regulation or law, every earl, baron, or knight, was bound to have in his possession as many complete suits of armour as he had knight's fees; every freeman who had rents or goods of the value of sixteen marks, one suit of armour; every freeman who had ten marks only, a habergeon, a cap of iron, and a lance; and every free burgess a wambois, a cap of iron, and a lance. The armour consisted of a



HELMETS.

coat of mail, a helmet, a shield, and a lance: and none of the arms, whether of earl, baron, or knight, or of freeman or burgess, were either to be lent, sold, pawned, or given for payment of debt, but were always to be kept in constant readiness for use. This famous law is said to have been adopted by various other nations, and to have been both wise and useful; but it may be doubted whether it was wise to put arms into the hands of the great body of the people at an age when rebellion had become a marked feature in its history.

Rebellion had been quelled in King Henry's dominions, but it was now rife in France. In the year 1182, the English monarch was again called to the Continent to settle disputes among the members of the royal family of France. This time civil war had broken out; but having procured an interview with Louis and the head of the contending parties, Henry once more restored tranquillity to that distracted court and kingdom. Yet peacemaker as Henry was at this period, he was again doomed to suffer disquietude in his own family. In the year 11[illegible] the unquiet blood of the Plantagenets once more asserted "the birthright of their race to be at variance." In the previous year he had prevented a rupture with his eldest son by noble generosity. That prince had spent several years in tilts and tournaments, attended by an expensive retinue of knights. His resources were not equal to his expenditure. He boldly demanded the cession of Normandy to enable him to reward his followers, and when this was refused, he retired into France, sullen and discontented. Henry, however, appeased him, and induced him to return by the promise of one hundred pounds a day for himself, Angevin money; ten pounds a day of the same money for his consort; and suitable rewards for one hundred knights. In order to secure family concord, he afterwards added the feudal ties to those of blood; ties which were in that age deemed inviolable. Early this year he held an assembly of nobles at Angers, in which he proposed that his sons Geoffrey and Richard should do homage to their elder brother Henry for their respective territories of Brittany and Aquitain. Geoffrey readily complied with the proposal, but Richard sternly refused. A war now ensued between the brothers. Henry and Geoffrey entered Aquitain with an army, Richard having previously proclaimed the ban of war. The contest was carried on between them with so much rancour that no quarter was given on either side. Henry hastened to put an end to these hostilities, and having induced his sons to appear before him in the vicinity of Limoges, he effected a reconciliation. But this reconciliation was not sincere; or if so at the moment, it was not lasting. In a brief space of time there was war again in Aquitain, and Henry himself was compelled to join in the conflict.

This second war appears to have been brought about chiefly through the influence of the troubadours of Aquitain and Poitou, Bertrand Bor[illegible] being at their head. Queen Eleanor had been bor[illegible] and born among the people of the two countries, [illegible] notwithstanding her moral delinquencies, was [illegible] regarded by them as their chieftainess. Henry, th[illegible] conceived, had no other right over them than th[illegible] which he could claim as an affectionate husband. B[illegible] Henry had long kept her in prison; and hence th[illegible] conceived it loyal and right to work for her deliv[illegible] ance, and punish her husband by whatever mea[illegible] they could command. When engaged in effecting th[illegible] reconciliation between his sons, he had been twice i[illegible] danger of being slain by the hand of treachery; and [illegible] those attempts having failed, his destruction was

it by open war. To stir up this war was the of the troubadours; to arm the sons against sire was with them a holy cause. Their satires ever levelled at him, keeping alive and inflaming atred of the people against their English monarch. the same weapon they inflamed the passions of oung princes against their father. Richard was l upon as the instrument by which his mother's gs would be revenged: he it was who was des- to "rescue her from the northern king, who her shut up like a besieged town;" and to anni- "all those who opposed him, from the least to reatest." At this time, however, Richard, who een rescued from the fury of his brothers by the timed interference of his father, was not disposed the avenger of his mother's wrongs. Richard orn, therefore, renewed his intrigues with the g King Henry and Geoffrey, who turned with re- ent against their father for saving their brother rd from their fury, just as they were on the of crushing him. Henry and Geoffrey, there- again revolted; and the French monarch, un- ful of Henry's recent good offices in restoring rd among his own family, openly announced lf as their ally. The war was renewed in Aqui- and it recommenced under a new aspect: it was ime King Henry and his son Richard on the one and the two sons, Henry and Geoffrey, on the . The head-quarters of the associated brothers at Dorat, in Poitou: and the bishops of Nor- y, at the command of the Pope, fulminated their mmunications against them and their adherents. e there, young Henry, under a pretence of suffer- remorse for his rebellious conduct, left the camp epaired to his father's court, where he implored obtained his father's forgiveness. He was not permitted to go at large, but to meddle in political s. Acting under his advice, King Henry adopted ures which cost him the lives of many of his ful followers. He was a spy in his father's camp, itor to his father's cause. But his career was ing to a close. He once more deserted to the insur- , and resolved with his brother Geoffrey to hazard tle. Before his preparations were completed, how- he was overtaken with a fatal sickness at Château el, near Limoges. According to some of the old rs, remorse for his unnatural conduct, combined his other passions, threw him into a fever of h he died. We question his remorse while in h; but in his dying hours it was of the keenest

In those hours he expressed the deepest contri- and sent a messenger to his father earnestly ching that he would forgive him and visit him e he died. Suspecting treachery, Henry refused to him, but he took a ring from his finger and it as a token of forgiveness and paternal affection. recorded that he pressed his father's ring to his ith much emotion, and that he expired on a heap es, where he desired to be laid as an act of morti- on and penance.

the death of his firstborn, Henry's heart was sore en. He fainted away thrice on receiving the igence, and when he recovered from his swoon, out into the bitterest lamentations. But his was mingled with revenge against the insurgents. Arousing himself from his griefs, he took the field against the barons of Aquitain and Poitou. Limoges was captured the day after the funeral of his son, and castle after castle was stormed and destroyed. Bertrand de Born, the soul of the conspiracy and the seducer of his children, fell into his hands, but contrary to the general expectation he was set at liberty; his clemency arising, it is said, from a touching allusion which the troubadour made before him to the deceased prince. The public tranquillity was once more restored. Prince Geoffrey sought and obtained his father's pardon, and the confederates generally hastened to make their submission. There was even a momentary reconciliation between the king and Queen Eleanor, who was released for a time to be present at a solemn meeting, wherein "peace and final concord" was established between the king and his sons; a peace which was "confirmed by writing and the sacrament."

Henry had at this time, A.D. 1184, returned to England. During his absence the Welsh had committed some ravages on the English borders, and he marched against them; but their prince, Rees ap Griffin, averted his anger by submission. After the family concord had been established, Geoffrey was sent back to the Continent; and in A.D. 1185 Richard was permitted to return to Aquitain. Prince John only remained in England. At a great council held at Windsor, on the 1st of April, John was solemnly

ROUND TOWER, WINDSOR.

knighted, and was then sent with a large army into Ireland; Hugh de Lacy, the sagacious lord deputy, being recalled. De Lacy had, with consummate ability, reconciled the people of Ireland to the authority of the English monarch. On the contrary, Prince John disgusted those whom he should have conciliated. It was during his rule in Ireland that John first displayed his real character, for he ruled tyranically and insolently. King Henry had placed the Irish chieftains at his own table, and had treated them with courtesy: John, when they approached him, encouraged his

attendants to ridicule their dress, and pluck them by the beard. If he had not been recalled, as he was in a few months, there would have been war and bloodshed; for instead of loyalty there was growing up a wide-spread disaffection among the Celtic population of Ireland. On his recall the chief direction of the affairs in Ireland were left to the brave John de Courcy.

Before the close of this year, Henry's presence was again required in Normandy. The family concord, which had been "confirmed by writing and the sacrament," was again broken. There was war between the brothers Geoffrey and Richard. Henry raised an army to march against either the one or the other; but Richard, at his request, resigned the duchy of Aquitain to his mother Eleanor, and peace was restored. While in Normandy, Henry met Philip, now the king of France, at Gisors, and settled a dispute with him about the dowry of Queen Margaret, the widow of the young King Henry; and solemnly engaged that the marriage of his son Richard with the Princess Adelais should take place without delay. Henry, however, found means to elude this engagement by sending Richard to prosecute a war against the Earl of Toulouse—the cause of which is not recorded—while he himself returned to England, A.D. 1186.

Henry had not been long in England when his domestic peace was again disturbed. Geoffrey demanded the earldom of Anjou, and, when refused, he withdrew to the French court to prepare for another war. But his turbulent career was cut short while in France. He was dismounted at a tournament, and trampled under the feet of the horses of the knights engaged in the lists, which resulted in his death. Philip, King of France, buried Geoffrey with great pomp. After his death, Philip invited Prince Richard to his court. The invitation was accepted, and there was extreme friendship between them; a friendship which in after years was succeeded by deadly hatred. As the French court had been the hotbed of machinations against Henry, he sent messages to recall Richard. He was reluctantly obeyed At length, however, he moved; but it was only to seize his father's treasures at Chinon, and to raise the banner of revolt once more in Aquitain. He began to fortify his towns and castles; but this time his designs proved abortive. His standard failed to attract a dispirited people, and he was again compelled to sue for pardon. Henry granted it; but to insure his fidelity for the future he made him swear on a copy of the Holy Evangelists, before an assembly of prelates and barons.

There was, no doubt, an understanding between Philip, king of France, and Richard, that they would mutually attack the continental dominions of King Henry. Geoffrey had left an infant daughter, and before Richard raised the standard of revolt in Aquitain, Philip had claimed the guardianship of the heiress of Brittany, and the government of her dominions during her infancy, threatening war if his demands were not conceded. Preparations had been made on both sides; and early in the year 1187, Henry went over to Normandy to meet the barons of France. Some minor operations in the field occurred; but a general action was prevented by the interposition of the good offices of legates commissioned by the Pope to bring about a peace. A truce for two years was concluded; and it was after this event that Richard went to the French court: so that it is clear that the French king was intimately connected with this last revolt of the son against the father; and that at the end of the truce, if not before, he would renew the war with Henry. In the mean time Constantia, duchess dowager of Brittany, was delivered of a posthumous son, who was named Arthur, and his mother was appointed guardian of his person and dominions under the protection of his grandfather the king of England. But notwithstanding this event, and the reconciliation of Prince Richard with his father, it is probable that the war between England and France would have been renewed, had not events in Palestine occurred which induced the two monarchs to be at peace with each other—at least for a season.

Since the capture of Jerusalem, A.D. 1099, the Christian kingdom had been upheld under six successors of its first monarch—the illustrious Godfrey. Their dominion was now at an end. Saladin the Great, originally a humble soldier of the pastoral tribe of the Kurds, after having become lord of Egypt, and after many a hard-fought battle, in which the blood of the soldiers of the Cross had been shed like water on the ground, had captured Jerusalem. In England there were two powerful bodies especially sworn as the defenders of the Cross—the Knights Templars and the Knights Hospitallers. In the year 1185, Heraclius, patriarch of Jerusalem, arrived in England to urge Henry, as the representative of Fulke of Anjou, whose descendants had been kings of Jerusalem for half a century, to rescue the city from Saladin, into whose hands it was then about to fall. Henry referred the question to his great council at London, as to whether he should engage in the enterprise, or whether he should remain to govern the dominions of which Heaven had given him the charge. The council decided that he should remain in Europe; at the same time permission was given to as many as chose to go the East: and many went and perished by the sword of the Saracen. In the same year Henry had a consultation with the king of France on the affairs of the Holy Land—Heraclius being present. Neither of the two kings could be prevailed upon to undertake a crusade in person, but both promised aid in men and money. But if the aid had been given it was of no avail. In the year 1197 the renowned Saladin was victorious: the crescent triumphed over the cross. This news spread alarm throughout Europe. A pope is said to have died of the grief it had caused him, and a king wore sackcloth, while most of the sovereigns trembled, or pretended to tremble, for the safety of their possessions. The triumphant Mussulmans might possibly invade *their* dominions: something must be done to check their victorious career. On this both Henry of England and Philip of France were agreed; and on this ground they resolved to lay aside their enmities and do battle conjointly with the infidels. At Gisors, under an old elm-tree, after hearing an eloquent discourse from the lips of the enthusiastic archbishop of Tyre, they swore to "be brothers in arms for the cause of God." Each attached a cross to his dress; swearing never to quit it or neglect the duties of a soldier of Christ either upon

or sea, town or field, until the victory was won. ce Richard, who became one of the most renowned iders that ever wielded a battle-axe in Palestine, taken the Cross; before and the example of these ces was followed by many barons and knights. er this same elm-tree another solemn peace was ceased; and then Henry returned to England to e ready for the Holy War.

his time Henry seems to have been in earnest. a great council held at Gidington in Northamphire, in February, A.D. 1188, the question of the s and means was resolved upon. A crusade in stine was an expensive affair; and the consent of he vassals was required as to the mode in which means were to be provided. It was enacted, there-, with the consent of the barons, both lay and esiastic, that there should be levied a contribution ne-tenth of all rents for one year, as well as a tenth ll the moveable property in the country; the books he church and the arms and horses of the knights pted. It was levied, but was found to be insuffi-t. Recourse was now had to extortion and violence inst the Jews: for though it was considered a itorious act to assist in the recovery of their ancient , it was at this period deemed to be no sin to rob oppress them. The tax levied upon the Jews was the rate of one-fourth of their personal property; it produced nearly as much money as that from the rest of the kingdom put together. But the ney thus wrung from Jew and Christian was never ployed against the Mussulmans. The oaths of these ristian princes became a mockery; and resulted rekindling the flames of war on the Continent.

This new commotion was raised by king Philip and fiery Richard. Another meeting was held under old elm-tree at Gisors, at which the two kings ld not agree as to terms of accommodation. The nts which led to this conference were briefly these. ere had been war between the earl of Toulouse and ince Richard. Many of the earl's towns were cap-ed, and his capital was threatened with a siege, on ich he implored the protection of his liege lord the g of France. Philip accordingly marched with an ay to his aid, and invaded Henry's territories in ry. Ambassadors were sent to expostulate with , but in vain; and then Henry hastened to the ntinent to retaliate Philip's hostilities. Both had emnly sworn to carry their arms into Palestine; but s war was adverse to their project. Hence, as the l of Flanders and other barons and knights were tious to proceed to the Holy Land, they urged a eting between the two kings to adjust their dif-ences, in order that they might be at liberty to art. But the conference had the contrary effect hat which they desired. Philip, with whom Prince hard was banded, offered peace and the restoration his conquests on these conditions: that the marriage his sister Adelais with Prince Richard so long de-ed should be forthwith consummated, and that nry's subjects, both in England and on the Conti-nt, should do homage to Richard as heir of all his minions. Henry had suffered greatly in consequence elevating his eldest son in the same manner, and refused. A violent altercation ensued. Richard rged his father with a design—whispers of which had been spread abroad—of giving the English crown to his youngest son, John. There does not appear to have been any grounds for this; but Richard, disappointed in his present hopes, chose to believe it, and having given vent to his fury he ungirdled his sword, and in the presence of his father acknowledged Philip as his protector, and did homage to him for *all* Henry's continental dominions. That homage was received; Philip confirming it by giving him all the towns and castles he had recently captured.

Agitated by this scene, Henry mounted his horse and rode to Saumur, to prepare for the prosecution of the war. His troubles, however, had now done their work. His frame became enervated. He was no longer the energetic monarch of former days. While in the year 1189, Philip and Richard were capturing his castles and seducing his vassals he remained inactive. The people of Normandy, however, still adhered to his cause; and at his request its seneschal swore that in case of his death, of which he had a presentiment, that he would deliver all the fortresses of that province to his son John. The Church, also, was zealous in the cause of King Henry. Philip and Richard were both threatened with excommunication; and this led to another conference—the Pope's legate, Cardinal John of Anagni, being present. But the same proposals were made with the same result. Henry proposed that Adelais, instead of being united to Richard, should be wedded to his *dutiful* son John: at the same time declaring that he would, if his proposal was accepted, declare *him* heir to all his continental dominions. But Philip would not abandon his bosom friend Richard. So violent was the conduct of both that the legate threatened to put France under an interdict, and then their rage turned towards him. Philip charged Cardinal John with venal and corrupt motives, and the fiery Richard drew his sword and would have slain him had not his arm been arrested. Henry again mounted his horse, and this time with a heart full of despondency. His enemies now increased daily. The people of Aquitain, Poitou, and Brittany were all arrayed against him. Led by Richard, they attacked him both in the west and the south, while the French king made war in the north. Thus deserted, Henry was induced to solicit peace, and the two kings once more, and for the last time, met in conference. The place of meeting was a plain between Tours and Azay-sur-Cher: Richard was not present. This conference was broken up by a violent thunderstorm, and Henry's sudden illness. The conditions of peace were, therefore, submitted to him in writing. They were read to him by the French envoys as he lay on his bed of suffering. One of the articles was, that all such barons as had espoused the cause of Richard should be considered his vassals unless they of their own free will chose to return to the king's allegiance. Henry asked for a list of their names. It was handed to him, and it was fatal to his life. In that list, and at the very head of it, stood the name of his *dutiful* and favourite son John! He read no more. "Is it true," he asked, "that John, the child of my heart: he whom I cherished more than all the rest, and for whom I have drawn on my head all these troubles—is it true that he hath verily betrayed me?" He might well doubt the fact and conceive that the

document was a forgery; but he found that it was true. Then turning his face to the wall he exclaimed in the bitterness of his soul—"Let everything go as it will. I have no longer care for myself or the world!" It was a stroke too heavy to bear: it was a mortal wound! If his queen had been there she would have seen that she had had her revenge to the full, for the whole tenor of her history points distinctly to the fact that she had been the mainspring of all the rebellions which this great King Henry Plantagenet had endured in his family. A burning fever followed all the excitement and wrongs which Henry had undergone, in the midst of which he poured bitter maledictions upon the heads of his two sons, Richard and John, and of which he died at Chinon on the 6th of July; his natural son, Geoffrey, who was unwearied in his attentions to his stricken father, receiving his last sigh. Henry was buried at Fontevraud; and it is recorded that Richard met the procession, accompanied it to the church, looked at his father's face for the last time, shuddered at the awful expression which his last agony had impressed upon it, and then mumbling a prayer before the altar, departed. But, cut off in the prime of his manhood, Richard, as will be seen, in a few short years, was brought to the abbey of Fontevraud as a corpse, to be laid at the feet of that father whom he, in common with all his brothers, had during life so deeply and unjustly wounded.

During the reign of Henry Plantagenet, England made many advances in power and prosperity. With a few brief exceptions, peace had been maintained; and there is evidence to show that the condition of the people had been generally elevated and improved. As regards his personal character, historians are divided in their opinions: some blacken it, others represent it as almost without a blemish. These are extremes. Henry had his vices, but he also had his virtues. That he was unfaithful to his queen there can be no question; and it is equally clear that his unfaithfulness brought much trouble on his head. But it must be remembered that Eleanor was not faultless. She was a lascivious and vindictive woman; one with whom few husbands could live in peace. Still this does not justify his criminal attachment to the "fair Rosamond." Lust was, therefore, one of his vices. History shows that he was also ambitious of dominion; but that was a common vice of the race from which he sprung, and was a natural consequence of the position in which he was placed as king of England. The lust of power is ever growing: there are few who possess it who do not aim at increasing it. It is like the greed for gold: it is never satisfied. Alexander, when he had conquered the then known world, wished for another to lay under his feet. Henry's detractors say, also, that his dissimulation, duplicity, and disregard for truth, when he had any political purpose to serve, were all extreme. Perhaps so; but this must be placed to the account of his ambition: it is the curse of the ambitious to be faithless. More kings than one have spoken lies at conferences, and over the table, in order to increase their dominion. Again, his detractors say that he was anxious to concentrate all power within his own person, and to depress and degrade his nobles. This is certainly not borne out by the history of his life. He curbed their turbulence for the peace of his kingdom, which was a just and righteous act: but he never oppressed them. That he was irascible, which is another charge laid against him, may be, and is true: but, as in the case of Thomas à-Becket, his wrath was too generally elicited by extreme provocation. As a rule, he was courteous and affable, and even playful in his manners. That he was of a forgiving temper previous pages testify. Few fathers ever had more rebellious sons, and yet he loved them to the last: for if he did utter maledictions upon the heads of those living in his last hours, they were called for by their undutiful conduct. And even those curses appear rather to have been the ravings of a frenzied than the utterances of a rational mind. According to his contemporary, Girald, he was more than usually affectionate to them when infants: and if ever that affection was withdrawn from them, it was the result of their ambition, turbulence, and treachery. Of Henry's learning, Peter of Blois thus writes in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Palermo:—"Your king knows literature well: ours is much more deeply versed in it. The constant conversation of learned men and the discussion of questions make his closet a daily school." He adds, respecting his general character:—"No one can be more dignified in speaking, more cautious at table, more moderate in drinking, more splendid in gifts, more generous in arms. He is pacific in heart; valorous in war; but glorious in peace, which he desires for his people as the most precious of earthly gifts. It is with a view to this that he receives, collects, and dispenses such an immensity of money. He is equally skilful in erecting walls, towers, fortifications, moats, and places of enclosure for fish and birds. His father was a very powerful and noble count, and did much to extend his territory; but he has gone far beyond him, and has added the dukedom of Normandy, Aquitain, and Brittany; and the kingdoms of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, so as to increase beyond all comparison the titles of his father's splendour. No one is more gentle to the distressed, more affable to the poor, more overbearing to the proud. It has always indeed been his study by a certain carriage of himself, like a deity, to put down the insolent; to encourage the oppressed; and to repress the swellings of pride by continual and deadly persecution." In a word, though Henry Plantagenet's character was not faultless, it possessed many noble and endearing qualities: even one of his greatest enemies acknowledges "that he was endowed with so many excellent qualities, both natural and acquired, that there was no prince in the world comparable to him."

The few fragments of history preserved concerning Scotland and Wales have been interwoven in that of the reign of Henry Plantagenet, and therefore need not be enlarged upon. As recorded, Malcolm IV., surnamed the Maiden, relinquished the northern counties of Cumberland and Northumberland to him without a struggle, and did homage to him for the county of Huntingdon. His submission to Henry was distasteful to his Scottish subjects, and hence his latter years were disturbed by frequent insurrections. Malcolm died A.D. 1165, and was succeeded by his brother, William the Lion, who endeavoured, as before

ree himself from the power of Henry, but
ken captive while making war in Eng-
npelled to pay homage to him and hold
in fief to the crown of England. No
subsequently made by William to throw
although both galling to himself and his
he contrary, he lived in peace and amity
and even married Ermingard, a near
his, at Woodstock. William survived
han twenty-five years; and therefore the
f his reign belong to a later period, where
duly recorded.

SECTION VI.

RICHARD CŒUR DE LION.

œur de Lion, or the Lion-hearted, as-
ather's throne without opposition. His
disputed; and feeling secure, he lingered
on the Continent before he sailed for
e entered, however, at once upon the
vernment. Touched with compunction
al behaviour to his father, he renounced
had aided him in his rebellion; while
ad faithfully served the late king were
iis services and enriched with numerous
is father's councillors became his; and
his mother, the Queen-dowager Eleanor,
kingdom during his absence. At the
he ordered the liberation of all state
r the good of the soul of Henry her lord,
in her own person, she had learnt, by
hat confinement is distasteful to man-

ed by his brother John, King Richard
tsmouth on the 13th of August, A.D. 1189,
3rd of September was solemnly crowned
ter. His coronation was more than
nificent. There were hosts of the hier-
obility present on the occasion. Earls
sceptre, crown, and golden spurs; and
barons supported the canopy under
lked to the altar. His path was spread
the Tyrian dye, and in his train there
company of earls, barons, and knights.
ved on the steps of the altar by Baldwin,
f Canterbury, who performed the cere-
e midst of all this feudal pomp, Richard
erve peace, harmony, and reverence to-
oly Church; and to exercise justice and
ls the people committed to his charge.
ired him in the name of Almighty God
the regal dignity unless he purposed to
hs he had sworn; and having repeated
the great and massive crown, decorated
stones, was put on his head, and Richard
the summit of his wishes—he was king

ical incident marked the gorgeous cere-
ard's coronation. After it was over he
great hall of Westminster with the
nobles: some of the lesser barons waiting
t this date the Jews were everywhere
of persecution. When Philip, king of
crowned, all Jews were banished his
kingdom; while their property was confiscated, and the obligations of their numerous debtors annulled. As Richard was known to be in familiar intercourse with Philip, the Jews in England expected to be similarly treated by him. He does not appear to have contemplated such an iniquitous measure; but the day before his coronation he issued a proclamation forbidding "Jews and women to be present either in the church while he was crowned, or in the hall



CORONATION CHAIR.

while he was feasting." During the preceding reign, the Jews in England had amassed great wealth; and, following a custom sanctioned by remote antiquity among all Oriental people, notwithstanding this proclamation, they assembled to offer presents to their new king: it was a graceful act, but they paid for it dearly. Their presents were readily accepted; but, according to the chroniclers, the courtiers rose against them, stripped and cast them forth out of the hall with wounds and blows. A report spread among the citizens of London that the king had commanded the destruction of the unbelievers; and following the example of the courtiers they beset them in the streets, and drove them with "staves, bats, and stones" to their homes. Some were killed by the way, and those who escaped to their houses found no refuge. Their houses were burnt to the ground, and they perished in the flames. There was a general massacre and plunder throughout London; and it was the signal for an attack upon the Jews throughout the kingdom. No mercy was extended to them. At York, the principal Jews, being shut up in the castle,

slew their wives and children and then destroyed themselves. Richard at last issued a proclamation, stating that he took the Jews under his special protection, and three of the offenders suffered death at his command; but this was not altogether in that spirit of justice in which he had sworn to govern: they were punished, "not for the sake of the Jews, but on account of the houses and property of the Christians which they had burnt and plundered:" some of which had been consumed by the spreading of the flames. Beyond this no judicial measures followed this outrage. The hatred of the Jews which existed at this period arose partly from the contests for the recovery of the Holy Land: for both Jew and Turk were considered inimical to Christianity. Avarice, also, had its influence in stirring up that hatred; for many of the Jews had lent large sums of money at an exorbitant rate of interest to enable the barons and knights to obtain outfits for their expedition to Palestine, and by murdering their creditors they cancelled their bonds.

Never did a monarch ascend a throne less fitted to rule a people than King Richard. From the very first the affairs of his English subjects were grossly neglected. The oaths which he took at his coronation were forgotten as soon as uttered. His thoughts were wholly engrossed about the crusade he had agreed to enter upon with Philip of France. Visions of glory obtained by deeds of arms in the East were ever floating in his brain, and he burned to realize his day-dreams. With him for the present the great question was how he should go to Palestine with a splendid army, and leave the care of his kingdom and subjects to others. He had found a hundred thousand marks in his father's treasury; but this was wholly insufficient for such an enterprise. He had recourse, therefore, to extraordinary expedients to raise money for his wants. He sold the crown demesnes; and he sold public offices, earldoms, and even the claim which his father had asserted—and which he so highly prized—to the right of homage for the crown of Scotland! "His presence chamber," writes Sir Francis Palgrave, "was a market overt to which all the king could bestow—all that could be derived from the bounty of the crown as imparted by the royal prerogative—was disposed of to the best chapman." Hugh Pudsey, the bishop of Durham, purchased the earldom of Northumberland, together with the lordship of Sadburgh. This same bishop, also, gave one thousand marks for the chief justiciarship—Ranulf de Glanville, an able minister of the late king's, having resigned it; or, as other writers represent, was dismissed by Richard that he might dispose of it to the highest bidder. Richard was even guilty of simony, for he filled up all vacant abbacies and bishoprics, exacting a heavy fee from each abbot and bishop appointed. He granted his peace to his half-brother Geoffrey, who had been elected archbishop of York, for three thousand marks, and obtained other sums of money by means less justifiable. If he could find a purchaser he said he would sell London: so little compunction did he feel in thus degrading the king for the ambition of the crusader.

Before his departure for Palestine, Richard appointed a regency. His brother John expected this dignity, but he was disappointed. At a great council held at the monastery of Pipwell, in Northamptonshire, Hugh Pudsey was exalted to that office. He was to be *Rector Regni* and *Procurator Regni*. William de Mandeville, earl of Albemarle, was his coadjutor in the justiciarship, but the earl soon after left England, and the bishop was left sole justiciary as well as regent. But he did not remain so long. Before Richard left his authority was subdivided, and while the king was yet in Normandy the justiciarship was taken from him and sold again to Longchamp, bishop of Ely and chancellor of England. In order to appease his brother John, he gave him several earldoms in Normandy and England, and his mother Eleanor was gratified by the gift of all the lands that had been enjoyed by the two queens—Matilda and Alice—of Henry Beauclerk. Eleanor was to be consulted in the affairs of government, but John was to have no voice in the national councils.

It was but little more than three months after his coronation that Richard left his fair kingdom to its fate. He conceived that it was the highest duty of a warrior, a monarch, and a Christian, to drive the Moslems from Jerusalem. The duties of a ruler of his people were as light as air compared with this. Hence having got all the money he could on this side of the channel, he crossed over to Normandy to obtain more from his continental subjects. Both himself and Philip had pledged themselves that they would depart for Palestine at the festival of Easter, A.D. 1190. It was midsummer, however, before they set out on their expedition, for Philip had been delayed by the death of his young queen. Before they commenced their journey they entered into a solemn compact of alliance and fraternity of arms: each swearing that he would defend the life, honour, and rights of the other. They were to be sworn friends during their enterprise, each protecting the other from danger. In such a spirit they marched to Lyons at the head of one hundred thousand men, who were composed of the flower and chivalry of Europe. At Lyons they parted company, Richard taking the road to Marseilles, and Philip to Geneva, from whence he was to sail in a Genoese fleet to the coast of Syria. Richard's fleet was to meet him at Marseilles, but as it had not arrived he pushed forward to Messina. His fleet met him there, and so also did Philip, who came thither to settle a quarrel with Tancred, king of Sicily, about his sister's dower. It was settled by Tancred's paying Philip forty thousand ounces of gold, and by the betrothal of his daughter to young Arthur of Bretagne, the nephew of King Richard. While at Messina there was a quarrel between Richard and Philip, who had so recently sworn eternal friendship. As before seen, Richard had been betrothed to Philip's sister Adelais, and the sworn friends had made war upon King Henry because he had delayed the nuptials. But it would not appear that Richard had been greatly enamoured of the French princess, or if he had his love had grown cold. He had seen Berengaria, daughter of the king of Navarre, and had despatched his mother Eleanor to proffer his hand to her. It is clear that all the clamour he had raised about the fair Adelais was merely for political purposes, for after he had become king he dropped all

ıer, and while at Messina he flatly refused
:. This caused a violent contention between
gs; but Philip accepted a money payment
our of his sister, and departed for Syria.
Berengaria soon after came to Messina,
ichard set sail for the Holy Land. But
eached his destination he engaged in
ode of war. Some of his vessels were
Cyprus, and after the manner of the
more uncivilized countries, his mariners
ubjected to barbarous inhospitality. In
hard engaged in a contest with Isaac,
Cyprus, whom he conquered: Isaac was
a heavy tribute, and was kept in cap-
day of his death. At Lymasol, in Cyprus,
married to Berengaria, and then Queen
rned to England.

t before the 5th of June, A.D. 1191, that
sail from Cyprus. At this time Acre had
s been in vain besieged by the crusaders.
age, Richard fell in with a large galley
nunition and stores for its relief. It was
nded by Richard's smaller vessels. The
mond," as the galley was called, was at-
great impetuosity, but the battle was for
ubtful. From the high deck of the "dro-
terrible liquid flame called "Greek fire"
down upon the English, and they would
eaten if Richard had not threatened them
xion if they allowed the galley to escape.
nd" was captured, and was afterwards
oard, with the exception of thirty-five men,
to the bottom of the sea. In that wreck
perished. The English fleet now ap-
re. As it came in sight, Richard gazed
h tower of the city, and then the smaller
wed their formidable front. The crusaders
ped on the plains, while on the distant
them was the mighty army of the re-
din. As Richard reached the coasts, he
ith a shout of joy, and there was a mighty
martial instruments, to which was added
f national songs. The welcome was not
han the aid was needed. There had been
of life during that long and memorable
word and the plague had swept away six
twelve bishops, forty earls, five hundred
more than a hundred thousand of the
So write the chroniclers of the age; and
that much of the best blood of Europe
ed before the walls of Acre; for it was
oughout Christendom that the fate of
he East centered in its capture, and
a every part of Europe flocked thither to
the Saracen infidel.

tions of the besieged had for some time
and if Richard and Philip had cordially
with each other, their flags would soon
n the ramparts of Acre. But almost as
met, these sworn brothers in arms again
Each in their turn with their separate
pted to take the city, but both failed,
nds of men through their folly. The
the English soldiery shared in the ani-
eir leaders; and of the other crusaders,
some sided with Richard and some with Philip. The Pisans and Knights Hospitallers ranged themselves on the side of the English; and the Genoese and Knights Templars fought under the flag of France. At length, through the mediation of the bishop of Beyrout, the two kings became reconciled, and so vigorously did they now prosecute the siege that the Mussulman garrison capitulated. As a ransom for their lives they were to restore the wood of the cross on which Christ died, set at liberty all Christian captives, and pay two hundred thousand pieces of gold to the conquerors. Richard and Philip entered Acre in triumph, and their banners were raised with equal honour upon its ramparts; but scarcely had this "terrible town" been captured when Philip expressed his intention of returning to Europe.

An old chronicler writes:—

"That king Philip was annoyed there at the thing,
That not a word of him was spoke, but all of Richard the king."

Richard had displayed great bravery and skill in the capture of Acre, and therefore he was the most popular. But it was not his popularity alone that induced Philip to abandon the enterprise. He had his own schemes to pursue in the absence of Richard, which a future page will unfold. Yet before he left Acre he took an oath that he would not invade Richard's continental dominions, or attack any of his vassals, till he returned from Palestine. As a pledge of his sincerity, Philip left ten thousand of his men under the command of Richard; but they parted in anger and mutual hatred.

Richard the Lion-hearted was now sole leader of the Crusaders. His first act, as such, is a stain on his memory. Saladin had delayed to restore the wood of the true cross within the time agreed, and had asked further time. But Richard, who aspired to destroy the Mussulmans, root and branch, as well as to abolish the faith of Mahomet, and to establish the Christian religion on its ruins, would not listen to the request. The Turkish hostages, to the number of two thousand seven hundred, were led forth from the gates of Acre and hanged, his soldiers executing his command with delight: "thus retaliating," says an old chronicler, "with the Divine Grace, by taking revenge upon those who had destroyed so many Christians with missiles from bows and alablasts." In this guilt the duke of Burgundy participated by massacring all the prisoners taken by the French; and Saladin, following the example set him by these soldiers of the Cross, slew all his Christian prisoners. After this mutual slaughter, Richard marched towards Jerusalem at the head of thirty thousand men; the renowned Templars leading the van, and the Knights of St. John bringing up the rear. Their march was infested by the armies of Saladin, who cut off many brave Christian knights. But Richard took a terrible revenge at Azotus. On the 7th of September he gained a great victory over the pagan forces: thirty-two emirs and seven thousand men perished, and the hitherto victorious Saladin took refuge in flight. The prowess of Richard on this occasion is represented as being almost superhuman: "wherever he turned brandishing his sword he carved a wide path for himself." The road to Jerusalem was now open, but his forces being worn out with toil and

heat, rested awhile at Jaffa. It was November before Richard resumed his march, and this delay was fatal to the success of his arms. Incessant rains drenched the Crusaders to the skin, spoiled their provisions, and rendered the roads almost impassable. Crossing the plain of Sharon, they pitched their tents at Ramah, but the wind tore them up and rent them to pieces. Famine, disease, and desertion thinned their ranks, and they retreated to Ascalon. This strong place had been dismantled by the Saracens; and, aware of its importance as a place of defence and refuge, Richard resolved to restore its walls and battlements. In order to set a good example, Richard himself assisted in the work; but there was one among the Crusaders who disdained to soil his hands with labour—the proud duke of Austria. There was a quarrel at this time between Richard and this proud duke: Richard had torn down an Austrian banner from one of the towers of Acre, and had flung it into the moat below. This affront was not forgotten. When called upon to assist in the fortification of Ascalon, the Austrian duke indignantly refused, and Richard turned both him and his vassals out of the town. There was a division in the camp: Ascalon was fortified, but before the winter was over there was a great defection among the Crusaders. Hitherto Richard's generosity had

KNIGHT TEMPLAR.

kept them together, but the vast sums of money he had collected were now nearly gone; and all except his English and Norman followers forsook his standard and retired to Acre. He notwithstanding concentrated his forces for the purpose of striking a blow; but he evidently feared the issue, for he wrote to Europe for succours. But scarcely had Richard despatched his letter when, in the spring of A.D. 1192, news were received from England unfavourable to his enterprise.

Richard looked upon England as a great treasure-house of money, and a great hive of men; both of which were requisite for the success of his "Holy War." But there were commotions in his kingdom. His brother John had played him false. As soon as he was fairly on his way to Palestine, John through the country courting popularity. S did he become that he was looked upon as t heir, and he even received homage for the r of Lincoln. As before seen, the regency placed in the hands of Hugh Pudsey, bisho ham, with whom was associated the c William de Longchamp. Pudsey had l cipher in the state, for Longchamp assu exercised all the power. Two pictures are the chancellor: one depicting him as a grasp who slighted the English nation and exha kingdom by his rapacity; and the other as amiable, wise, generous, and meek—bount liberal to the highest degree. There were tv in the kingdom, one on the side of Longcham other on that of Prince John. That of Joh strongest. At a solemn meeting held in L sentence of removal and banishment was pa the chancellor, and his high powers of re justiciary conferred upon him by King Richl revoked. John was elected chief justicia kingdom, and at a subsequent meeting of n citizens, fealty was sworn to John "against saving always their fealty to King Richard. champ, who was a native of Beauvais, fled to F in the disguise of a woman, there "to wa time when Richard should take thought of t whom he had left to the misgovernment c or the nongovernment of anarchy." Such news that Richard received from England. same time he learned that, disregardful of Philip of France was threatening an att Normandy, and that his brother John wo joined him had he not been prevented by t mother, Eleanor.

Finding that his throne was in danger, opened a negotiation for peace with th Saladin. During their contest, Richard an had learnt to appreciate each other as Saphadin, his brother, had even been knight English monarch, and presents had been frequ changed between the two leaders of the c hosts. But Saladin would not do what Ri quired of him. He asked for the possession salem and the wood of the cross; but he was Jerusalem was as dear to the Mussulman a Christian, and that the laws of Mahomet v permit Saladin to connive at idolatry or the ping of a piece of wood. The sword, theref decide the quarrel. In May, Richard once his face towards Jerusalem. But Saladin ha by the season of inaction. Not only had Jerus strongly fortified, but there was a mighty he its walls to bar the way against the C Richard had reached Hebron before he d this; and he then called a council, in whi decided that, instead of attacking Jerusale from whence Saladin received his supplies, a besieged. Richard having gazed upon from the hills surrounding the vale of Hebro aside from the one grand object of his enterp a heavy heart. He was even compelled to his expedition to Cairo. No sooner had the command been given for a retrograde moven

RICHARD CŒUR DE LION BEHOLDING JERUSALEM.

all discipline was at an end, and Richard and his English and Norman followers fell back upon Acre. The vigilant Saladin now advanced against Jaffa, and after a great slaughter it was captured. When Richard heard of the siege of Jaffa, he was preparing to embark at Acre, and his rage at receiving the intelligence knew no bounds. With all the forces under his command he now retraced his steps. He embarked with his knights in a fleet of galleys, and after some delay arrived in the harbour of Jaffa. The citadel was then captured, and his land forces had not arrived. With his battle-axe in hand, however, he threw himself into the water, and with a small band of his knights reached the castle. Richard then boldly encamped outside the gates, having only two thousand men with him, of whom not more than ten were mounted. In this position he was attacked by the hosts of Saladin. A terrible battle ensued. Richard fought with the fury of a lion. Prodigies of valour were performed by him and his ten mounted knights; they scattered the Saracens wherever they rushed. At nightfall victory declared in his favour. But this battle, which was not decisive, was the last fought by Richard in the Holy Land. He had fought from the rising to the setting sun against fearful odds, and his toil was followed by a fever. Both he and Saladin were desirous of rest. By the good offices of Saphadin an armistice was agreed upon, which was followed by a truce on these conditions—that Ascalon was to be dismantled; Jaffa and Tyre, with all the country between them, were to be possessed by the Christians; and pilgrims were to have free access to the holy places of Jerusalem.

It was on the 9th of October that Richard, accompanied by his queen, his sister Joan, and his few surviving bishops and nobles, set sail from Acre.



ACRE.

His ship was detained a month by contrary winds at Corfu, and here he hired three coasting vessels to take him and twenty of his companions to Ragusa. They landed in the guise of pilgrims, and with a single attendant Richard rode day and night till he reached Erperg, in the neighbourhood of Vienna. Of all the places in the world that was the one which Richard should have most avoided in his journey homeward. It was in the neighbourhood of one of his bitterest enemies—the proud duke of Austria. His presence at Erperg was discovered by his page. Being sent to the market-place of Vienna to buy food, his person was recognised by one who had been with the Austrian duke in Palestine. This led to Richard's captivity. A band of soldiers was sent to seize him, but he drew his sword and swore that he would not surrender to any but their chief. That chief—Leopold, duke of Austria—soon arrived. "You are fortunate," said he with a sneer, as he received Richard's sword: "had you fallen into the hands of Conrad's friends, you would have been a dead man, though you had a thousand lives." Conrad, marquis of Montferrat, had been elected king of Jerusalem, but had been murdered before he was crowned at Ascalon, by assassins sent by their prince, commonly called "the old man of the mountain;" but the king of France had charged Richard with being the author of that assassination, and his story was believed. At all events, Leopold, duke of Austria, chose to believe it; and as he was also brother-in-law to Isaac, king of Cyprus, whom Richard had on his voyage to Syria conquered and held captive in silver chains, and had himself been kicked out of Ascalon by the renowned Crusader, he resolved on having his revenge. Richard was sent prisoner to the castle of Tyernsteign, and was afterwards sold to the emperor of Germany, who kept him in close custody in one of his castles in the Tyrol. It was some time before his prison-house was known. It was discovered from a letter written by the emperor to the king of France. All Europe was indignant at the treatment of the Lion-hearted Crusader. The people of England were faithful to their king; but Prince John was now in open hostility to his brother. He surrendered some portions of Richard's continental dominions to Philip, and did homage to him for the rest. John was in Normandy when his brother was imprisoned in the Tyrol; and on his return to England, accompanied by a band of mercenaries, he gave out that Richard had died in prison, in the hope of obtaining his crown. But the prelates and barons were firm, and his scheme was frustrated. Active exertions were made for the deliverance of the captive king, and the emperor of Germany was compelled to release him, though not without a princely ransom. He had bought him to sell him again to the highest bidder. John offered a bribe for his retention; but the ransom money had been agreed upon, and his perfidious offer was rejected. For a hundred thousand marks, which was raised by taxation, Richard's liberty was obtained, and he returned to his country in March, A.D. 1194. His reception in London was an ovation. Had he brought Saladin the Great with him as a captive he could not have been more warmly welcomed. There was great pomp and show; and the old chroniclers relate that one of the German princes who came with Richard to receive his ransom, on seeing the wealth displayed, declared that if the emperor had known of the riches of England he would not have been let out of prison so lightly.

Philip, king of France, on hearing of Richard's release, wrote to John telling him to take care of himself, for "the devil was let loose." Both had cause

for fear. Three days after his arrival in London, Richard, at the head of an army, marched to Nottingham and besieged the castle which belonged to his brother John. That perfidious prince had fled and the castle surrendered at discretion. This was on the 28th of March. On the next day he went to see Clipstone and the forests of Sherwood: the fame of the forest outlaws under the bold Robin Hood of ballad story, who now ranged through the vast woodland districts of Derby, Nottingham, and Yorkshire, probably presented an object of attraction to his adventurous spirit. He returned to Nottingham, and on the 30th of March a great council of prelates and barons was held there, in which certain disaffected barons were dispossessed of their fortresses and shrievalties, which were put up for sale to the highest bidder. At this council it was decreed that if John did not appear within forty days, he should forfeit all his estates in England; for "he had broken his fealty to Richard, had taken possession of his castles, and had made a treaty with his enemy Philip of France." At this council, also, a land tax of two shillings on every hide was decreed, and knight's service was demanded to enable Richard to carry an army to Normandy. William the Lion, king of Scotland, met Richard at Nottingham, where they had long discussions about their respective rights; but nothing was then settled. Subsequently, at Northampton, a charter was granted favourable to the dignity of the Scottish monarch; but Richard sternly refused to give him the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, which he solicited. In order to remove a supposed stain incurred by his imprisonment, by the advice of his council at Nottingham, Richard consented to be recrowned, and the ceremony was performed on the 17th of April, at Westminster. After his coronation, Richard resumed many of the honours and estates which he had alienated before his departure for Palestine, and for which he had received large sums of money; alleging that they were necessary for the support of the Crown, and that their purchasers had already indemnified themselves. Other means both oppressive and unjust were adopted to replenish his empty coffers; and then, having reconciled Geoffrey, archbishop of York, with Longchamp, whom he had reinstated in the chancellorship, he went over to the Continent, from whence he never returned.

Richard, with his warriors, landed at Harfleur on the 12th of May. He was met there by his brother John, who threw himself at his feet and implored forgiveness. His pardon was generously pronounced. At that time the King of France was besieging Verneuil. Philip fled at his approach, leaving his troops to make their retreat as they could. They were quickly pursued by the fiery Richard. The English monarch was now in his proper element, for he was far more fitted to wield the sword and the battle-axe than the sceptre. The armies of France melted before him. In a few months, Philip was driven out of Normandy, Touraine, and Maine; but the war lasted with intervals of peace to A.D. 1199, when, on the 5th of December, it was finally terminated by a treaty of peace which was concluded by the two monarchs in a personal interview.

The glory Richard acquired by the sword on the Continent cost the English nation much privation. He had left Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, regent during his absence, and his chief duty was to raise money for the support of his continental war. The modes by which money was raised were of the most oppressive character. The exactions were not only tyrannical but positively swindling. Thus, on one occasion, it is said that the great seal was broken, and that proclamation was made that no grant under the seal should be valid unless the fees due to the Crown were paid a second time for affixing the new seal. Great confusion ensued in the country from the tyranny of the king's ministers. In London, one William Fitz Osbert, commonly called Longbeard, a man of ruined fortunes and abandoned character, by his eloquence and fair pretences raised a formidable tumult among the common people and inferior citizens. Longbeard was looked upon as the saviour of the people, and when he appeared in public he was hailed with loud acclamations. Many bound themselves by oaths of the most solemn character to obey all his orders, and the richer citizens were made to tremble for their safety. Mobs infested the streets night and day. Longbeard was summoned by the regent before the council; but he was attended by such numbers of his followers that the council dared not ask him a question, and he returned in triumph. But Longbeard shared the fate of all mob orators: his popularity died away. He was now seized, condemned, and executed: no one standing by him in his hour of need. This event occurred A.D. 1196, after which, though the exactions went on as usual, the country was tranquil. Two years later the miseries of the people were increased by a famine, occasioned by a succession of cold and rainy seasons, and this famine was followed by a plague. According to the chroniclers this plague raged six months with so much violence that "there were hardly so many people in health as were sufficient to bury the dead, who were thrown into pits as soon as they expired." But, regardless of these distresses of his kingdom, Richard still warred on with his old rival Philip until, as before recorded, they concluded a treaty of peace.

This peace was brought about through the mediation of the Pope; and its grand object was, that Richard and Philip should again unite their forces against the Mussulmans in Palestine. That was agreed upon; but an event happened which put an end to this enterprise. Richard was preparing to return to England for the purpose of raising money for this new crusade. Had he returned no doubt his subjects would have been more grievously oppressed than ever; for his expedition would have been carried out on the grandest scale. But Richard did not return. Before the day on which he was to recross the channel, he was excited to an enterprise by the discovery that one of his continental barons had found a treasure of ancient coins on his estate. Richard laid claim to these coins as treasure-trove. The baron of Limoges, who was the lucky finder, offered to give up a large portion of the treasure, but he refused to surrender the whole. At the head of a body of Brabancons, Richard marched against the castle of Chaluz to take forcible possession of the coveted treasure. He laid siege to the castle, and the garrison offered to sur-

it, together with the gold and the silver, on
n that they should be allowed to march out
eir arms. This was wantonly refused: Richard
"that he would take them by storm and hang
ll." On the fourth day, he was reconnoitring
ress for that purpose, when an arrow aimed by
id de Gurdun wounded him in the arm. It
arbed arrow; and in those days surgery was of
rude character, and it could not be extracted
t much mangling of the flesh. In the midst of
ny, Richard gave orders for the assault, and the
was captured; and all its defenders, except
id de Gurdun, were hanged. This was the
ploit of the Lion-hearted King. For twelve
e suffered the agonies of his wound, and it
mortal. Convinced of his approaching end,
l bequeathed the kingdom of England to John,
hree-fourths of his treasures: the remaining
was to be given to his servants and the poor.
hen," writes Hovedon, "ordered Bertrand de
n into his presence, and said to him, 'What
have I done that you have killed me?' On
he answered, 'You slew my father and my two
s with your own hand, and you intended to
): therefore take any revenge on me that you
ink fit, for I will readily endure the greatest
t you can devise so long as, you have met with
id, after having inflicted evils so many and so
pon the world.' On this the king ordered him
released, and said, 'I forgive you my death.'"
is part of Richard's dying wishes was disre-
. After his death, which took place on the 6th
l, Marchades, the chief of the hireling soldiers
Routier, flayed Gurdun alive and then hanged
Richard was buried at the feet of his father in
bey of Fontevraud. He had reigned nearly
ars, but during that period had only spent
our months in England.

arks upon Richard's character and reign are
y needed. They belong more to the pages of
e than sober history. As it has been well re-
l:—"In the Lion-hearted King, the brilliant
eless character of a knight was, in a great
e, realized and revived; and the personal glory
he acquired by his own deeds of arms was far
ear to his excited imagination than that which
e of policy and wisdom would have spread
his government. Accordingly, his reign was
brilliant but rapid meteor, which shoots along
e of heaven, shedding around a useless and
tous light which is instantly swallowed up by
al darkness. His feats of chivalry furnish
for bards and minstrels, but afford none of
olid benefits on which history loves to pause,
old up as an example to posterity. In the
ge of the poet—

"He left a name, at which the world grew pale,
To point a moral or adorn a tale."

SECTION VII.

JOHN, SURNAMED LACKLAND.

he Crown of England had descended by strict
tary right, it would have adorned the brow of
r the son of Geoffrey, the third son of Henry Plantagenet. But Arthur was a boy only twelve years of age, and had neither the ambition nor the power to assert that right. John had been long ambitious of wearing that crown; and as soon as he heard of his brother's death he took every possible step to obtain the summit of his wishes. His claim was warmly supported by Richard's regent—Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury—and he was afterwards chosen king by the general consent of the prelates and barons. He was still in Normandy when his brother died; but he arrived in England on the 25th of May, and two days after he repaired to the church of St. Peter, at Westminster, to claim the crown.

John, surnamed Lackland, was not popular. There were many in England who would have preferred Arthur of Brittany as their king. It is said that Richard himself had repeatedly declared Arthur his heir; although John professed to have a will in his possession, drawn up in Richard's last hours, appointing him his successor. But no will was needed. The archbishop of Canterbury announced to the audience that John had been *elected* king by the prelates and barons at Northampton, and laid it down as a known principle that no one could by any previous circumstance be entitled to succeed to the throne of England unless he were chosen to be king by the great body of the nation. A king, according to this archbishop's dictum, should be elected for his excellent virtues: instancing Saul and David as examples. It was ordained by the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, he said, that he whose merits were pre-eminent should be chosen the lord of the people. Then referring to the paragon of a prince about to fill the throne of England, he added:—"If indeed of the family of the deceased monarch there be one thus supereminently endowed he should have our preference. And this I say touching the noble duke, John, here present, brother of our late excellent King Richard, who had no heir proceeding of his body. *He* possesses the same worthiness of qualities, and is also of the same blood as King Richard was of; and for these qualities, having invoked the Holy Spirit, we elect him our king." John, therefore, was called to the throne as an elective monarch for his pre-eminent merits! Assenting to accept the crown as such from the people, he took the usual oaths to protect the church and govern justly, and then all present cried out with a loud voice, "Long live the king."

King John was not the character Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, represented. His very physiognomy belied the tale. Like all his race he was handsome; but, if the old chroniclers tell the truth, his evil passions had distorted his countenance. That countenance had a treacherous and cruel expression. His former life, also, was contradictory to the assertion that he possessed pre-eminent merits. Had he possessed those merits why was he already hated by the people? Distaste to his rule was exhibited almost as soon as the crown was placed on his head. His English nobles became disaffected; and William, king to Scotland, quarrelled with him about the provinces of Cumberland and Northumberland, and threatened to invade his kingdom. His pretensions were acknowledged in Normandy, Aquitain, and Poitou; but in Maine, Anjou, and Touraine the cause of Arthur was

universally espoused. All the great vassals in those provinces took up arms for the young Plantagenet, and Philip, king of France, allied himself with them. Richard had said that his brother John was not made for conquering kingdoms; and Philip knew that he was no warrior and that a disputed succession would weaken his cause. Hence he took up arms with every chance of success; and before the end of June, King John, alarmed at the position of his continental dominions, returned to Normandy.

But Philip, king of France, did not espouse the cause of Arthur from any regard to justice or out of sympathy for him: it was to serve the ends of his own ambition. Soon after John's arrival in Normandy a truce was concluded between the two monarchs till August, when they were to meet to adjust their differences. They met; but Philip made demands both for himself and Arthur of such an extravagant character that John had spirit enough to reject them. Arthur had been taken to Paris by his mother Constance, and placed under the direct protection of Philip; for the grand aim of John was to obtain possession of the person of the young prince that he might rid himself of the boy rival. Ostensibly, therefore, Philip renewed the war for Arthur, but in reality for his own personal aggrandizement. Constance had offered him, as a reward for the protection of her son, the direct vassalage of Brittany, which Arthur was to inherit through her, and of Normandy, Anjou, Aquitain, and other estates which belonged to him as heir to his father. But it soon became manifest that he wanted the whole for himself. In conjunction with William de Roches, the leader of a small body of Bretons, he captured several castles on the frontiers of Brittany and France, some of which he demolished while he kept others in his own possession. De Roches read his motive: it was to leave the road open for himself when he should see his way clear to invade the country on his own account. Fearing for the safety of Arthur, by a stratagem De Roches withdrew him and his mother from the French court and conveyed them to Mans, of which he was governor. A treaty was concluded with John by the Breton leader, by which it was agreed that he should become his nephew's protector: but discovering that his life would not be safe under such protection, De Roches escaped with the young prince and his mother from Le Mans to Angers. Soon after this, in the spring of A.D. 1200, a treaty of peace was concluded between Philip and John, by which all Arthur's interests were completely sacrificed: John was to remain in possession of all the estates his brother Richard had occupied, and thus Arthur was disinherited.

But this peace was not of long duration. By one of its articles John was to pay a sum of twenty thousand marks to the French king, and he came over to England to obtain that sum. Having obtained it, and made a tour to some parts of his dominion, more for the sake of pleasure than attending to the affairs of his government, he returned to Normandy. He had scarcely returned when he managed to surround himself with difficulties. He had for some years been married to Avisa, daughter of William earl of Gloucester; but as he was making a progress through Guienne he fell in love with Isabella, daughter of the count of Angoulême, one of the most celebrated beauties of the age. Isabella had been betrothed to the count of La Marche, a powerful noble; but, dazzled with the offer of a crown, she consented to become John's bride: John having obtained a divorce from Avisa on the ground of consanguinity. This ill-fated union was consummated at Angoulême, the archbishop of Bordeaux performing the ceremony. John returned to England with his bride in October, and she was crowned at Westminster; but there were deep burnings of heart both in England and on the Continent concerning this imprudent and criminal marriage. While yet he was revelling in pleasures with his beautiful queen, in the spring of A.D. 1201, news arrived that the count of La Marche was seeking revenge for the injuries he had received. With his brother, the Earl of Eu, and several barons in Poitou and Aquitain, he was in arms against John king of England and duke of Normandy. Alarmed at this intelligence, John summoned his English vassals and military tenants to meet him at Portsmouth with horses and arms. But by putting away Avisa, daughter of the earl of Gloucester, he had created as many enemies or more in England as he had by stealing the betrothed of the count of La Marche on the Continent. Many of those summoned to meet him at Portsmouth refused to appear, declaring that the warfare was too insignificant and dishonourable for them to embark in. In truth, they were now preparing for an extensive opposition to King John; but for the present he triumphed; for although his barons would not go with him to assist him to quell the rebellion on the continent, they gave him hostages for their good behaviour during his absence.

John returned to Normandy with but few of his English subjects. But instead of attempting to quell the revolt, he first paid a visit to the king of France. Philip welcomed the king and his bride most cordially: he was a perfect master of deceit, and he entertained them right royally. But Philip was playing his old game of ambition. At the very time he was entertaining his royal guests, he was in league with the count of La Marche. John saw no indication of this double dealing; and he left the court of Paris with Isabella, well pleased with his courteous reception. After leaving Paris, John marched into Aquitain; and his wife, while he was gone to the wars, went to Rouen. But John was one of the most cowardly monarchs that ever sat upon a throne: he did not go to Aquitain to fight. On the contrary, having made a parade in a safe part of the country, he returned to his pleasures. The insurgents were now bolder than ever. Their power and confidence had increased by this show of war. Philip too soon threw off the mask of friendship. He had been under the ban of the Pope; but having become reconciled to the Holy Father in the spring of A.D. 1202, was again at liberty to draw the sword. The ostensible cause of his declaring war against John was the injury done to the count of La Marche; but Prince Arthur was again brought forward to further the ends of Philip's ambition. By the death of his mother Constance, in August, A.D. 1201, Arthur had become duke of Brittany; and aided by his own subjects and the dis-

contented barons of Guienne, he laid claim to all the dominions of his family on the Continent. Philip now declared himself the protector of the young duke and the barons of Guienne, and called upon John to do them justice; and it was when his demands were rejected that he declared war. At his instigation, Arthur, at the head of about five thousand troops, took the field in Poitou. It was not the policy of Philip, however, to afford him much aid; all he desired was a diversion in his favour while he invaded Normandy. At this time Arthur's grandmother, Eleanor, was at Mirabeau, about six miles from Poictiers. Eleanor had become the bitter enemy of his mother Constance, and had warmly espoused the cause of her son John against her grandson Arthur. Hoping, therefore, to obtain possession of her person, the young duke laid siege to the town and castle of Mirabeau. The town was captured; but Eleanor was still safe in the castle, when John, who on this occasion displayed unwonted energy, arrived suddenly with a powerful force, and the unfortunate Arthur, with two hundred nobles and knights, were taken prisoners. If John had used the advantage he had gained with prudence and moderation, he might have re-established peace on the Continent, and have gained for himself a name which would have insured popularity. But he was as imprudent as he was vindictive. All his prisoners were loaded with chains, and immured in the dungeons of Normandy and England. The ill-fated Arthur was first confined in the castle of Falaise, of which Hubert de Burgh was warden. According to some historians, De Burgh was required to put out the eyes of the young duke; an atrocity which he refused to perpetrate. The same authorities relate that Arthur was then removed to Rouen, where he was murdered, and probably by the hands of his uncle John himself. It is related, indeed, that he took Arthur into a boat, stabbed him twice, and then threw his bleeding body into the Seine. There are other accounts of the manner of the young duke's death: but that he was murdered all agree; and if not actually by the hands of his uncle, the deed was committed at his instigation. The murder may not have occurred exactly as the chroniclers report, or as Shakspeare has represented in his dramatic pages, but all historians hold John guilty of being the author of the deed, if he was not the actual assassin.

John had his reward for this foul deed. He became the object of general execration. Everywhere—in England and on the Continent—he was scorned and hated. There was one loud and universal cry of horror and indignation. The barons of Brittany accused him of the murder of their prince before the king of France, of whom he held all his continental territories. It was a golden opportunity for Philip. After the capture of Arthur at Mirabeau, he had retired from the invasion of Normandy, but he now resolved on its renewal. But first he summoned John to trial at the court of his peers, as a vassal of the French crown. The accused sent an envoy demanding a safe conduct. "He shall come unmolested," replied Philip. "But shall he return in safety?" asked the envoy. "If the judgment of the peers permit him," was the answer. The bishop of Ely, who was John's envoy, then urged that the duke of Normandy could not come without the king of England, and that the English barons would not permit their king to risk death or imprisonment. Philip, however, contended that his rights as lord paramount over the duke of Normandy were not lost because John inherited a kingdom which his ancestor William, who was the vassal of France, had acquired by force. John finally refused to appear, and the court adjudged that "whereas he, the duke of Normandy, in violation of his oath to Philip had murdered the son of his elder brother, a homager of the crown of France, and near kinsman to the king, and had perpetrated the crime within the signiory of France, he was found guilty of felony and treason, and was therefore adjudged to forfeit all the lands he held by homage."

Philip was not slow in carrying into execution this sentence of his court; and his movements were everywhere facilitated by the odium which attached itself to his rival. By the foul murder of his nephew, John had lost all power of resistance. Aided by the malcontents, Philip rapidly obtained possession of all the old fiefs of the Normans and Plantagenets. Thus, in the year 1203, he obtained possession of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine. In A.D. 1205, he recovered Normandy, with the exception of the Channel Islands, which still belong to England; and in A.D. 1206 he annexed Poitou to France: only Guienne and Gascony remained as foreign dependencies of the English crown. At the first outbreak of this storm, John was at Rouen, where he lingered for some time, pleasing himself with the idea that he could soon recover the power that was melting away before him. As the French army, however, approached Rouen, he fled to England, leaving his Norman subjects to fight their own battles. On his return to England, in order to remove the ignominy of losing the inheritance of his ancestors from his own shoulders, he threw a great part of the blame on his English barons. They had forsaken him, he said, and thereby put it out of his power to defend his continental territories: and while he fined some, he confiscated the estates of others for their desertion of his cause. But it does not appear that he ever really intended either to defend or to attempt the recovery of Normandy. In a parliament held at Oxford, A.D. 1204, he obtained the grant of a scutage of two marks and a half upon every knight's fee for raising an army to be sent thither, but no army was raised. Again, in the spring of the next year, John summoned his barons and military tenants to meet him at Portsmouth in order to attend him in an expedition to the Continent: but when the army assembled he changed his mind, and sent those who had obeyed his summons back to their homes. Subsequently, in the same year, he pretended that he *would* go to Normandy and recover his inheritance, and he put to sea at Portsmouth; but within two days he re-landed, and made his ridiculous excursion a pretence for exacting money from his military tenants for their non-attendance. In the year 1206, however, John did actually, when his duchy was lost, reappear on the Continent! Some of the nobles of Poitou still adhered to the English interests; and Guy de Thouars, governor of Brittany, had become jealous of the increasing power of France, and importuned by them he raised an army, with which, on the 9th of June, he embarked at Portsmouth. He landed at Rochelle,

captured the castle of Montauban, burnt Angers, and committed great cruelties and devastations. But his triumph was brief. He had no objection to plunder, but he did not relish the idea of a pitched battle. Philip of France was approaching; and John, deeming discretion the better part of valour, began to think of making good a retreat. He accomplished this in safety: he proposed an interview with Philip, and a day was fixed when the two monarchs were to meet in conference; but in the meantime John retired with his army to Rochelle, and stole off, like a coward as he was, to England. The contest was now over. The territorial loss entailed by the murder of Arthur, duke of Brittany, was tamely submitted to; and the question long disputed as to whether the Capetians or the Plantagenets were to predominate on the Continent was settled in favour of the former dynasty. But the abridgment of dominion, which England suffered through this criminal and cowardly monarch eventually contributed to her aggrandisement. "The precious stone set in the silver sea" henceforth had to fight her own battles, and to assert her own rights without dependence upon foreign lords. There was now no longer Saxon or Norman in the island; from this date it was in reality England, occupied solely by the English people.

During the progress of these events the queen-dowager Eleanor died, and was consigned to the tomb at Fontevraud. On this occasion John's conduct affords an apt illustration of the unprincipled character of his government. He granted a general pardon to all prisoners, whatever the cause for which they may have been detained, "whether for murder, felony, larceny, or breaking the forest laws;" but especially excepting "the prisoners taken in the late war: those also that were sent over from Normandy into England to be kept there and imprisoned." Among these prisoners was the "Maid of Brittany," Arthur's eldest sister, and John's own niece, who "wore out her life in confinement at Bristol." He could pardon the felon and murderer, but not this innocent princess nor the barons who had followed the fortunes of the injured duke Arthur. At this time there were many Jews in prison, immured there by John in the hope of extorting their wealth; and these, also, were excluded from the benefits of his pardon. The Jews in this monarch's reign were grievously oppressed. It is recorded that in a short time he wrung from them sixty thousand marks, equivalent to £700,000 of present money. Nor was this the sum of their oppressions, for, according to the Patent Rolls, he rewarded his favourites at their expense, issuing royal letters absolving them from all debts and liabilities to the Jews; these debts far exceeding the amount wrung from them for his own coffers.

It was the lot of King John to contend with opponents with whom he had no ability to cope. But degraded as he was, his arrogance was as rampant as ever. At this time Innocent III. filled the papal chair: one of the most resolved and ambitious men that was ever elected pontiff by a conclave of cardinals. Innocent was not satisfied with spiritual power, unless he could render that power an instrument for the subjugation of every European state to his sway. He had recently decided between rival claimants to t imperial crown of Germany, and had excommunicat Philip, king of France, for an unlawful marria compelling him by this powerful weapon of the chu to take back his lawful wife whom he had repudiat If Innocent had thus triumphantly exercised power over Philip, how then could the cowardly Jo withstand him? Yet it was with this dangerous pon he now embarked in a quarrel, and that at a ti when his unpopularity was undermining his throu

In A.D. 1207 the see of Canterbury became vac The monks of Canterbury had long claimed an exc sive right to elect their archbishop, although t right had never been conceded to them either by kings of England or the prelates of the province. this occasion, however, they resolved to assert it; s before the vacancy could be generally known t secretly chose their own sub-prior, Reginald, to primate. Reginald was sent forthwith to Rome get his election confirmed by the Pope. Before started on his journey he had taken an oath that would not publish his election without the consent the convent; but on arriving in Flanders his van got the better of his prudence. He assumed the st of the archbishop-elect of Canterbury, and exhibi the letters of his election to prove his dignity. T secret of the monks was thus divulged; and dreadi the opposition of the king, they asked and obtain leave of him to choose John de Gray, bishop of N wich, to the archbishopric. At a chapter held Canterbury, De Gray was unanimously chosen arc bishop, and King John went to Canterbury to witn his enthronization. That nothing might be wanti to render his election valid, some of the monks we despatched to Rome to secure the Pope's approbati of De Gray as primate. But there was a third par who felt aggrieved at these proceedings. The prela of the province had not been consulted in either these elections, and they sent their agents to Rome protest against them both as invalid on that accou It was a fine opportunity for Pope Innocent to sh his power, and he did not let it slip. There wa deal of money spent at Rome in this affair, for a wh year was consumed in pleadings, audiences, heari witnesses, and examining records, during which ti much gold changed hands. At length came the cision: Innocent decided that the choice was in monks. At the same time he chose for them; neither the sub-prior nor De Gray was, according his directions, to be primate, but Stephen Langton, Englishman of great learning and ability, who w then a cardinal at Rome. A better choice could have been made; but John did not choose that P Innocent should interfere with his prerogatives. grew furious at his interference. Armed men w sent to the cloisters of St. Augustine's, who, in t king's name, threatened to burn down their conv unless they immediately quitted it and leave t kingdom; all who were not bedridden were driv forth, and went as exiles into Flanders. Innoc had foreseen that John would be indignant, and h sent him a flattering letter, and four rings set wi precious stones, in the hope of conciliating him. was pleased with the rings, for he was a lover trinkets, but he was by no means conciliated by In

cent's courtesy. Not only did he expel the monks from Canterbury, but he seized upon the revenues of the see, forbade Stephen Langton to enter his kingdom, and treated the Pope with a bold defiance. In a letter which he wrote to Innocent he charged him with injustice and presumption in raising a stranger to the primacy without his knowledge; reminded him that he derived more riches from England than from all the kingdoms on this side the Alps—thus charging him with ingratitude: and finally declared that he would break off all communication with Rome if his holiness did not repair the injury he had done him. Innocent's pride was shocked at this defiant language, and in his reply threatened that if he persisted in the dispute he would put his kingdom under an interdict. This threat was treated with scorn. Wilful and revengeful as he always was, he was determined not to yield to the authority of the pontiff. The Pope long professed to be a "merciful father." He wrote to the barons of England to do all they could with the arm of flesh to save their king and kingdom from perdition; and to the prelates, commanding them to exercise their spiritual weapons in defence of Langton and the church. Some of the prelates were commissioned to expostulate with John, and if they still found him refractory, to threaten him personally with an interdict; but at their interview with him he was more furious than ever. He dared them or any of their body to promulgate an interdict: if they did he would send them all to Rome and confiscate their revenues and estates. But John found that his opposition was in vain. On the 23rd of March, A.D. 1208, the very prelates whom he had threatened—London, Worcester, and Ely—pronounced the sentence, and then fled for safety to the Continent. Every bishop in England, except one, followed their example. But the papal ban was not at this period so terrible as it might appear. The churches were closed, and the clergy refrained from performing some of their duties; but the monks and nuns had their religious offices within their own walls; the sacraments were administered to infants and the dying; sermons were preached in the churchyards on the sabbath; and marriages were performed at the church doors, as was ordinarily the usage in the middle ages—the benediction and eucharist, which alone had been performed at the altar, being omitted. Those who suffered most were the clergy themselves, they generally losing their incomes during this anomalous state of society.

That state of society lasted six years, during which period John affected to "care for none of these things." He appeared to despise the Pope's fulmination; and yet there was clearly an under-current of fear mingled with his bold defiance. This is evident by two facts: first, that he demanded and obtained hostages from his chief nobility as a security for their good behaviour under the pontiff's infliction; and, second, that he was careful to give his barons and dangerous men-at-arms full occupation lest they should revolt. Innocent's wrath aroused him from his lethargy; for during this period he undertook three expeditions. In the year 1209 he led an army against William, king of Scotland, whose claim to the counties of Cumberland and Northumberland being still unsettled, again unsheathed his sword. William had demolished a fort near Berwick, and the forces of the two kings came face to face on the borders of Scotland. But there was no battle. A treaty was concluded by which John made some concessions, but of what nature there is no record; and William agreed to pay him fifteen thousand marks for that concession. After his return from the north, despite his critical situation, John again acted like a tyrant. Matthew Paris says that he forbade the popular diversions of hunting and hawking, under the severest penalties, and that he commanded all fences about the royal forests to be thrown down, that his deer might roam over the corn-fields of his subjects. In the spring of A.D. 1210 his time was chiefly employed in raising money by the most unjustifiable means. All classes suffered by his exactions; but the poor Jews were the chief victims. At Bristol, it is recorded that he ordered a tooth to be drawn daily out of the mouth of a wealthy Jew until he consented to pay ten thousand marks, which had been demanded of him and refused. Seven teeth were extracted, and then the torture had its effect: he gave security for the money. John represented that he wanted money to raise an army to drive Philip, king of France, out of Normandy—a popular idea with the people; but when all was ready he sailed for Ireland, where his English subjects had for some time defied his authority. His presence in Ireland with a powerful force was hailed as a blessing by the Irish chiefs, for there were three English nobles who had exercised great tyranny in that country—namely, Hugh de Lacy, earl of Ulster; Walter de Lacy, earl of Meath; and William de Braiose, all of whom had at the commencement of John's reign received extensive grants of land in Ireland. Twenty Irish chiefs made their homage and swore fealty to John on his arrival at Dublin, and with their aid he overcame all opposition. The oppressing English nobles fled to France to escape punishment for their tyranny. While in Ireland, John originated some useful reforms, among which was a division of the portions of the country in his possession, over which he appointed sheriffs and officers to act under the crown. John also coined the first sterling money circulated in Ireland, it being the same denomination, weight, and fineness as that circulated in England. Leaving John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, as his chief justiciary in the sister island, King John returned to his old work in England—that of tyranizing over his subjects. This time it was the monks and nuns that he fleeced by his exactions. All the abbots and lady abbesses, together with the heads of the monastic houses, were summoned to meet him in London, and having got them in his hands, he would not suffer them to return to their cloisters until they had handed over to him one hundred thousand pounds. With this money he undertook his third expedition. He marched into Wales, A.D. 1211, against Llewellyn, the prince of North Wales, who had married his natural daughter Jane. Llewellyn had made incursions into England, but he readily submitted to his father-in-law. John received Llewellyn's homage for his principality; twenty thousand head of cattle and forty horses for the expenses of his expedition; and twenty-eight hostages for his son-in-law's

future fidelity; then he returned to England to be finally humbled to the dust by Pope Innocent.

John's expeditions into Scotland, Ireland, and Wales had contributed to support his authority and prevent any commotions in England during his absence. Despite the interdict from which the people suffered, they still remained tranquil. But Pope Innocent was not to be baffled in his attempts to humble the rebel monarch. Finding that his ban on the kingdom had not the required effect, in the year 1212 he proceeded a step further. A sentence of excommunication was pronounced against John personally. But both combined were powerless: John still ruled the kingdom. He had not the affection of his subjects; but they failed in the purpose for which they were issued—that of fomenting a rebellion against his authority. It is true many of the English barons were secretly disaffected, but it was not on account of the interdict or excommunication. That was the effect of his avarice, lust, and cruelty. Suffering under these, they longed for a favourable opportunity to take revenge on their sovereign, and that opportunity soon presented itself. Finding that neither the interdict nor the excommunication had prevailed, Innocent proceeded to greater extremities. There was yet one terrible weapon left in the papal armoury, and it was now hurled at John's devoted head. The papal sentence went forth that he was deposed, and that his vassals were absolved from their allegiance. Innocent called upon all Christian princes and barons to take part in his dethronement. Llewellyn, prince of Wales, was the first to take up arms to execute this papal decree, for he entered the country and ravaged it with fire and sword. Enraged at his son-in-law's perfidious conduct, John raised an army, and threatened the total extermination of the Welsh nation. He marched to Nottingham, where the hostages given by Llewellyn for his fidelity were hanged without mercy. It was while he was at Nottingham that he discovered there were designs forming against him by his barons. Still, after some delay, he pressed forward to Chester. It would appear that he still hoped the news might not be true, or that the revolt was not sufficiently formidable to check his progress into Wales. But by the time he reached Chester the plot formed against him was ripe for execution, and convinced of his danger, he dismissed his army, and returned to London to take measures for his preservation. Some of the conspirators fled out of the kingdom, others were imprisoned on suspicion, while others gave their sons and nearest relations as hostages for their fidelity. That danger had passed away; and John, surrounded by foreign mercenaries, still thought himself safe. As for Pope Innocent, John still defied him. Towards the close of this year Pandulph, the Pope's legate, sought to reconcile him to the court of Rome; but he was still too proud to submit to the papal terms of reconciliation. Meanwhile the storm of papal vengeance was gathering thick around him. The chosen instrument of Innocent for putting his arrogant sentence into execution was the ambitious king of France. It was Philip who was called upon to enforce the pontiff's sublime pretensions to be the sovereign of sovereigns: that same Philip who had been, in years gone by, made to humble himself before the papal throne. He was to have a twofold reward f his enterprise: he was to have the kingdom of En land as a grant from the Pope, and all his sins we to be remitted. Philip could not hesitate. In Apr A.D. 1213, a great army was assembled by him Rouen, and there was a fleet of seventeen hundr ships at Boulogne in readiness to bring that arm across the Channel to take possession of Englan For once John took a bold step. He summoned eve man that could bear arms to repair to the coasts Kent, and ordered that every ship in his dominio capable of carrying six or more horses should assemb at Portsmouth. There was a willing obedience to th summons and commands of King John on this occ sion. The love of their country predominated in th hearts of the English over the deep feeling of disgu they had so long cherished towards their monarc So many crowded to the rendezvous that numbe who came imperfectly armed were sent back to the homes; but sixty thousand Englishmen still remain firm around the standard of John on Barham Down The fleet which was collected at Portsmouth ev anticipated Philip's attack, for it crossed the Channe destroyed many ships at Fécamp, and burned Diepp to the ground; the whole coast of Normandy wa ravaged, and the English mariners returned i triumph. The invasion of Philip was postponed in truth it never took place; and it is doubtfu whether Pope Innocent ever designed that it should his grand object being to lay King John prostrate a his feet, and he succeeded.

Philip was still on the opposite shore eager to obtai his prize, and John was at Barham Downs with hi sixty thousand Englishmen to meet him if he dared t set foot on English soil. Both monarchs were out witted by the wily pontiff, Innocent. While the were thus resting on their arms, *he* stepped in an deceived the one and conquered the other. Pandulph the Pope's legate, again appeared on the scene, an through him Innocent triumphed over the cowardl John. It is evident that had he stood firm the p triotism of his subjects would have helped him to ha overcome his difficulties. But his courage failed hi Supported as he was at this moment by his people, yet suffered himself to be ignominiously defeated simple craft. Pandulph, through the medium of t knights templars, again sought a conference with th refractory son of the church. It was granted. Jo and the Pope's legate met at Dover; and Pandulph this interview drew such a powerful picture of t French army of invasion, and represented the disco tent of the English barons in such glowing colou that he was terrified. But John had no occasion fear. "The Pope," said Pandulph, when he saw th the coward trembled, "is a merciful master, and requir nothing that is not necessary either to the honour the Church or the king of England's security." A Innocent wanted was John's absolute submission. was for this that he had laid his kingdom under a interdict, had excommunicated and deposed him; an had incited Philip to raise an army to take poss sion of his kingdom, and he now obtained it to h heart's content. After some little wavering, John d clared himself ready to accept any conditions the Po should impose. The conditions were these: that

would receive Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury; that he would recall the exiled bishops and others who had taken part against him; and that he would reverse all outlawries and make restitution for property unlawfully seized. These conditions being fulfilled, the interdict and excommunication were to be revoked. But there was still something else to be done. John had been deposed, and it was not sufficient that he should simply submit to the papal demands in the matter of an appointment to an archbishopric. He must be still further humiliated, and the nation must share in his humiliation. A fanatic called Peter had predicted that he would cease to reign before Ascension-day, and John, though notoriously irreligious, was a prey to superstition. He interpreted the prophecy that he should die, and his soul sank within him for fear. Thus dejected, Pandulph brought about the consummation of his ignominy. It was on the 13th of May that John consented to submit himself to the Pope. The next day was spent in secret council with the legate. And then came the final result of this celebrated contest between Pope Innocent and King John. On the 15th of May, the kingdom of England was laid at the feet of the Pope of Rome, and John, on taking an oath of fealty, received it back again as his vassal. Where in all the records of history can be found such an instance of craven-heartedness in a monarch? An instrument subscribed by John and nine earls and two barons was put into the hands of the legate, by which this cowardly descendant of brave ancestors granted, to Pope Innocent and his successors, the kingdom of England and Ireland, to be held of him and of the Romish church in fee for the annual rent of one thousand marks; reserving to himself and his heirs the administration of justice and the peculiar rights of the crown. All fear of the Pope was now over; but John was not yet free from apprehension that he should soon have to resign his crown. The morrow was the fatal term—the feast of the Ascension. But it came and it passed away and John was alive. His terror was gone and his cruelties revived. Peter the fanatic was hanged as a false prophet; but the people contended that he was not, for that, by laying his crown at the feet of a foreign priest, John had verified the prediction.

Having won the kingdom of England for his imperious master, Pandulph crossed the Channel to France. Philip was still waiting to receive orders to invade England; and the reader may judge of his mortification when he was told that he must not molest a penitent son and faithful vassal of the Church, nor presume to invade a kingdom which was now the patrimony of St. Peter! Philip remonstrated, but in vain; the nuncio's inhibition was repeated, and he withdrew. He was neither to have the kingdom of England nor the remission of his sins. All his labours in raising an army was lost; the treasures he had spent in collecting his armament wasted; and his hopes dashed to the ground. Philip was full of wrath. He inveighed bitterly against the selfish and treacherous policy of Innocent, and forthwith marched to the coast. But dared he brave the thunders of the Church which John had braved in vain? If he did, his vassal, Ferrand, earl of Flanders, did not; he refused to follow his liege lord in such a dangerous enterprise. Philip's wrath was now turned against Ferrand. He vowed that he would make Flanders a mere province of France, and he marched after him; taking some of the earl's best towns in his route. He laid siege to the strong city of Ghent. Thus threatened, Ferrand applied to John for aid, and the fleet which lay ready in the harbour of Portsmouth was despatched to Flanders to assist him. The French fleet lay at anchor at Damme, near Bruges, and a great naval battle was fought in which the French navy was annihilated. Some historians maintain that this was the first great naval action between the English and the French; but a battle fought by soldiers embarked in vessels navigated by fishermen cannot be considered a maritime engagement in the modern sense of the word. But the consequences of the victory were important. The siege of Ghent was raised; and Philip having lost the means of supporting his army in Flanders, or of transporting it across the Channel to England, retired into France, leaving earl Ferrand to recover all he had lost without opposition.

The consequences were also important to England, for out of them arose one of the most remarkable and important events recorded in the multifarious pages of English history. Inflated by the success of his navy, John imperiously called upon his barons to follow him to the Continent to recover his lost territories. They were summoned to meet him at Portsmouth with their armed retainers. They met him there; but they refused to embark unless he recalled the exiles as he had covenanted. John never intended to do this, but he gave a reluctant consent; and archbishop Langton with the exiled bishops and monks now soon arrived in England. John and the archbishop met at Winchester where they kissed each other; and John, having been absolved from the sentence of excommunication, again swore to govern justly and to maintain his fealty to the Pope. But, in the midst of this seeming reconciliation, there was evidently an utter estrangement between the king and the primate. John had in truth lost not only his confidence but that of his subjects generally. He was a monarch in whom they could place no trust. So suspicious were they of his conduct, that the barons still refused to sail with him to the Continent. Time had passed away in these transactions; and alleging that their term of feudal service had expired, and their provisions exhausted, they withdrew to hold a great council at St. Albans. At this council, resolutions were published, in the form of royal proclamations, ordering the observance of the old laws, and denouncing the punishment of death against all the officers of the king who should do anything contrary to those laws. John had sailed with a few ships for the Continent; but finding, when he had reached the isle of Jersey, that his barons did not follow him he returned, vowing vengeance against "the traitors." With a band of mercenaries, he marched to the north, where the barons were most contumacious. Burning and destroying, he came to Northampton. Here he was met by the primate Langton, who boldly told him that his barbarous measures were in violation of his oaths; "his barons," he said, "must stand by the judgment of their peers and not be harassed by arms." But John heeded him not. Telling him to

"mind his church, and leave him to govern the state," he proceeded to Nottingham. Here again the intrepid primate overtook him; and this time he threatened to excommunicate him and his followers; if he continued to prosecute his vengeance. John had no wish to be excommunicated a second time, and he desisted; but to show that he was yet a king, he summoned his barons to meet him to answer for their conduct. Langton now convened another council at London, when he produced the charter which Henry the First had granted on his accession, which having been read, all present swore that they would conquer or die in support of their liberties. They were now fairly roused; but the battle for liberty was yet to be postponed for a period.

In the autumn of this year a legate—Cardinal Nicholas—arrived in England to take off the interdict, to settle the indemnity due to the exiles, and to receive John's renewed oath of fealty to the Pope. So good a son of the Church did John prove himself to be on this occasion, that the court of Rome consulted him instead of the primate on the ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom. The claims of the archbishop and the exiles who had suffered so much for the papal cause in the late quarrel were set aside; and in bestowing vacant benefices, those only who were recommended by the king were considered. As for the cause of the barons, that was utterly abandoned by the papal court; but the patriotic Langton still cleaved to them; and all, despite the Pope and king John, resolved to strike for liberty, the dawn of which was fast approaching.

Meanwhile, John made an attempt to recover a part of the old Plantagenet dominions on the Continent. Early in the year 1214 there was a formidable league formed against Philip of France. Instead of adding another jewel to his crown, he was in danger of losing his kingdom. The confederates were King John of England; Otho, his nephew, now emperor of Germany; Ferrand, earl of Flanders; and Reynaud, earl of Boulogne, with others of less note. France was to be divided between the four principal confederates. John was to have all the country beyond the Loire; Ferrand Paris and the Isle of France; Reynaud, the country of Vermandois; and Otho all the rest. John landed at Rochelle, full of hope that he should regain the lost duchy of Normandy. The Pope and an emperor was on his side, and he could not doubt of success; and Normandy gained, then would be the time for him to humble his haughty English barons. Some advantages were gained by him in Poitou; but while there his confederates, who had invaded France, were utterly defeated. In a great battle fought at Bouvines, between Lisle and Tournay, the allied armies were routed with great slaughter, and all John's pleasing prospects vanished. Flushed with victory, Philip was approaching Poitou; and John having concluded an ignominious truce with him for five years, abandoned his conquests and returned to England.

John arrived in England on the 20th of October. In his train there was a large body of foreign mercenaries, on whom he counted for support in the contest between him and his barons. His temper was now more ferocious than ever. It had been soured by his recent bitter disappointment. And he at this time had no one about him who could moderate his fury. His justiciary, Fitz Peter, who had been able to restrain him from oppression in some degree, was dead, and he is said to have rejoiced at the event. "By God's teeth!" he exclaimed, "now for the first time I am king and lord of England." He believed that with the aid of his mercenaries he should be so; and he had scarcely set foot in England when he let them loose on the land, and began to violate all his most solemn promises. But his barons were prepared to overthrow his tyranny. The time had come when a king of England should rule by law—should respect oaths made at the time of their coronation—or lose the crown. Such was the high resolve of the primate Langton and the confederated barons. At a solemn meeting held on the 24th of November, at St. Edmondsbury, they bound themselves by oath that they would withdraw their allegiance from John if he should resist their claims to just government. Thus pledged, they agreed to meet again at the feast of the Nativity. At that festive season, John was at Worcester, and, contrary to the custom of the age, none of his great vassals came thither to congratulate him. Even his own attendants were reserved. This was ominous. Alarmed at this silent contempt of him, John hastened to London, and shut himself up in the house of the Knights Templars. Thither, on the feast of the Epiphany, A.D. 1215, he was followed by his barons, who laid their claims before him. At first he despised them; but the barons continuing firm, he changed his behaviour. Their claims, he said, required consideration before he could give an answer. They must give him time to deliberate, that he might do justice to himself, and satisfy the dignity of his crown. They gave him time. He was to give his answer by Easter. But his demand for time to deliberate was an act of subtlety. No sooner had the barons retired to their homes than he adopted measures to frustrate their design. He propitiated the Church by the promise of a free election of superiors to all cathedrals, monasteries, and conventual societies; he sent envoys to the Pope to implore him to aid him against his refractory vassals by launching the thunders of the Church against them; and he took the cross and engaged to wage war for the recovery of the Holy Land. This latter step was one which he conceived would infallibly rescue him from the power of his barons, for by taking the cross he placed his person, his estates, and his kingdom under the protection of the Church till he returned from his enterprise. But the barons were not to be cheated out of their claims. Both they and Stephen Langton were firm in their determination to obtain them. Pope Innocent wrote a threatening letter to the primate, but his patriotism was unshaken by it. The interests of his country were dearer to his heart than the pontiff's favour. Easter came, and the barons assembled with a large force at Stamford. John was then at Oxford; and their leaders, Stephen Langton and William, earl of Pembroke, were with him. The barons marched to Brackley, within a few miles of Oxford; and on their approach John sent the archbishop and Pembroke to demand what were the liberties and the privileges they desired. A schedule containing the chief articles was delivered them. It contained their just claims, they said, and if they were not in-

unted, their ultimatum was that they would sword. John was furious at the contents edule. He swore with his usual oath that not grant them liberties which would make ve. Then his temper cooled. He offered essions; but as they were evasive, the barons em. Pandulph, the legate, who was present, that the archbishop of Canterbury ought to nicate the barons; but he replied that if the not send his foreign mercenaries out of the ne would excommunicate *them*.

elected Robert Fitzwalter as their general, s now proclaimed themselves "The army of f Holy Church." Their first operation was ful. They besieged the castle of Northamp- aving no battering rams, and it being stoutly by John's mercenaries, they were compelled he siege. The enterprise they had under- surrounded with difficulties. With anxious y marched to Bedford. Here their hopes ered. The people of Bedford threw open s; and, while there, messengers arrived with news that the good citizens of London were their cause, and would receive them with barons entered London on the 24th of May. ion was here issued by them requiring all ns and knights, hitherto neutral, to join them he perjured monarch, if they did not wish to as the enemies of their country. This was

Barons and knights flocked to London from ra. John was deserted; only seven knights near his person. The whole nobility of had joined "The army of God and of Holy

John's cause was desperate. He was then a, in Hampshire; and, dissembling his rage, was again sent to the confederates, and this ged with a message of peace. He was ready grant all they required, and only wished ame a day and place of meeting.

y fixed for this ever-memorable meeting was of June, and the place of meeting the meadow of Runnymead, between Windsor es. John arrived at Windsor on the 10th of l at the appointed time he left his fortress to arons. They met. On the one side was John, t bishops; Pandulph, the legate; Almeric, r of the English Knights Templars; William, 'embroke; and others of less note: on the bert Fitzwalter, and the whole of England's

Many of those who accompanied John to the adow by the river Thames, like Pembroke, ourable to the cause of the barons. There ely a true friend of the king among them. powerless. He took his pen, and with but nur signed the scroll presented to him. That Magna Charta; and it contained the foun- the liberty which England now so richly From the date of the signing of this famous ew soul was infused into the people of Eng- he seed of liberty, sown by the confederated n that eventful day, has grown into a wide- tree, under the branches of which all f society—the noble and the mean. the lord peasant—may rest securely, none daring to em.

Although the great charter was signed on the first day of the meeting at Runnymead, the deliberations were not closed till the 23rd of June. It had been signed with a facility that excited suspicion; and the barons wisely demanded securities for its due observance. In the first place they required that the foreign mercenaries should be sent from all the royal castles which they occupied out of the kingdom. This was *promised*. In the next, the barons demanded the right of holding possession of the city of London —Stephen Langton occupying the Tower—for two months. This was conceded. But the most important security demanded and granted was this—that the barons should be allowed to choose twenty-five of their own body to maintain the observance of the peace and liberties confirmed by the charter. These guardians of the liberties of the kingdom were to have power, if any breach was made and not instantly redressed, to make war on the king, and to distrain and distress him by seizing his castles, lands, and possessions, and in any other manner they could, till it was: always, however, saving harmless the persons of the king, his queen, and their children. This right of levying war upon the king would seem to have been an arbitrary exaction, but it was necessary. If King John's barons were rigid, they were wise and prudent men. He was a faithless monarch, and without such a security Magna Charta would have been a dead letter. His after-conduct proves that they were justified in obtaining this solemn recognition of their right to levy war should he prove false to his engagements.



CLAUSE OF MAGNA CHARTA.

The great assembly dispersed, and John again ensconced himself in Windsor Castle: not that over which the world-honoured flag now waves, but a fortress on the western side, where a tower of the twelfth century still looks proudly upon Thames Street below. There was a scene in that fortress after the barons had triumphed. The old chroniclers record that John, when he seated himself in the royal apartments, was as frantic as a madman. He cursed the charter he had signed; and as the curses escaped his lips, he gnashed his teeth and gnawed sticks and straws, as one of his ancestors had done before him, in his impotent rage. He meditated revenge; and when revenge is obtained the old proverb says "it is sweet." He determined to undo all he had done. One messenger was sent to Rome again to implore the aid of Pope Innocent; another was sent to Flanders, Poitou, Aquitain, and Gascony, to hire mercenaries to come to his assistance against his barons. Other messengers were sent to the governors of his castles—foreigners

for the most part—commanding them to prepare for defence. All this was done secretly. Tyrants and subtle politicians work mole-like—in darkness. And yet they often outwit themselves, as did King John, for with all his secret machinations he himself caused the alarm. There was a tournament to be held at Stamford by the barons to celebrate their triumph, and during their absence a plot was formed by him to surprise London. His design became known; the tournament was postponed; and John went to Winchester. A deputation waited upon him at Winchester to remonstrate; but he swore that their suspicions were groundless and that he would observe the charter. This was at the end of June. In July he went to the Isle of Wight, and on his return moved about from place to place, restless and moody. At the end of August he was at Sandwich; and in September at Dover and Canterbury. He was waiting for an army of mercenaries; and it can be imagined with what anxiety he gazed across the Channel to see them approach. At length they came. Numerous bodies of freebooters stole into the land at different points and gathered around him at Dover. Rochester Castle was then in the hands of the barons, and John broke his pledges in October by laying siege to it. After a siege of eight weeks it was reduced by famine; and had he not been prevented by one of the leaders of the foreign bands, who had a wholesome dread of retaliation should the barons finally triumph, the whole garrison would have been massacred. As it was he contented himself with the butchery of the inferior prisoners, and sending the knights prisoners to the castles of Corfe and Nottingham. During the siege fresh bodies of adventurers crossed the Channel, but fortunately one of the largest hordes collected by John's agents perished in a tempest between Calais and Dover. Still his forces were numerous; so much so that the barons who marched to the relief of Rochester, fearing to attack them, returned to London.

Meanwhile John's envoys had met with a favourable reception at Rome. As the articles of the great charter were read to him, Pope Innocent knit his brows, and when the reading was over he swore by St. Peter "that he would not suffer a king who bore the sign of the cross and was a vassal of the holy see to be thus treated with impunity." In his rage he excommunicated the barons, and annulled the charter. His insolent mandate went further. England, he said, was a fief of the holy see, and the king had no right to surrender the privileges of the crown without the sanction of his feudal superior. But the barons were nobly supported by the patriotic churchman, Stephen Langton. He refused to endorse the Pope's excommunication of the barons, for which he was suspended from his functions. The Pope's mandate was despised: the barons disputed his right to interfere in temporal matters, and prepared to do battle for the seed of liberty they had sown at Runnymead. The heartless and faithless John, however, was emboldened by this support of his cause by Pope Innocent. At the head of his mercenaries he marched to St. Albans: his course being marked by fire and slaughter. London was menaced, but the attitude of the city alarmed him; and leaving a strong force to hover round it and lay waste the south-eastern counties, he marched northward: resolved to recover his lost aut the terrors of a wide-spread desolation. Hi to Nottingham and from Nottingham to Y counterpart of his march to St. Albans: d and death waited upon his steps. Every village and hamlet in his route felt the f execrable mercenaries. It is even recorde set them the example of vengeance by se with his own hands to the house in whic reposed the previous night. All the castles which these fierce mercenaries could capt destroyed by fire, and the atrocities comm them were diabolical. John had no thought his whole soul was bent on vengeance. Alex young king of Scotland, had joined the ca barons, and was investing the castle of Nor



NORHAM CASTLE.

on the approach of John he recrossed the b John, vowing he would "unkennel the youn followed him to Edinburgh. He entered S January, A.D. 1216, and as he marched alon towns and abbeys without distinction; but ing Edinburgh he met with a stern oppositi again returned to England: still burning a wherever he came. The days of William queror were revived: it was kill, burn, an both in the north and in the south; for work of terror went forward southward, command of John's illegitimate brother, t Salisbury; and every castle captured was g the adjoining estates, to some hungry and blo mercenary

In the midst of this terror and desolatio sentence of excommunication was promulg the city of London was laid under an inter the citizens of London had the boldness to d papal bull. They rang their bells and went as usual, and spent their Christmas with festivity. But the barons began to despai hosts of mercenaries were continually arri while they were confined in London their were becoming a prey to new invaders. T of the country were also flocking to L refuge, for they chose rather to abandon th and properties than perish under the hands fiendish mercenaries. The position of the b one of great difficulty, and, after long co they made a dangerous experiment to r tranquillity of the kingdom. Matthew Paris

in the bitterness of their souls they cursed both the king and the pope; and it was in the midst of this bitterness that they came to a resolution which nothing but absolute despair would have justified. Robert Fitzwalter and the earl of Winton were sent to offer the crown of England to Louis, eldest son of Philip, king of France! There was deep policy in this resolution of the barons; for prince Louis was connected with the reigning family by his marriage with John's niece—Blanche of Castille; and as the mercenaries who were warring against the barons were chiefly subjects of France, it was believed that, should Louis land in England, they would join his standard. Philip and Louis readily accepted the brilliant offer: the more so as the Pope had so recently outwitted the French king in the matter of the English throne. In February a French fleet, with a small army, sailed up the Thames to London, and its commander brought an assurance that Louis would arrive with a larger force at Easter. In the meantime, Pope Innocent was active in John's cause; or rather his own, he conceiving that the kingdom of England was a fief of the holy see. His legate, Gualo, was despatched to England, and on his journey through France he witnessed the preparation Louis was making for invasion. Gualo demanded how he dared to attack the patrimony of the church; but Louis, although threatened with excommunication, advanced a claim to the English crown by right of his wife, and departed for Calais to join his army. He landed at Sandwich on the 30th of May. As his fleet approached, John, who was then on the Kentish coast in great force, retired to Winchester, burning and ravaging the country as he went along. From Winchester he went to Bristol, where he was joined by the legate Gualo. Louis besieged Rochester Castle, reduced it, and then marched forward to London. He was received in solemn procession. All the good city of London hailed him as their deliverer. He was conducted to St. Paul's, where the barons and citizens did homage and swore fealty to him, and where he swore that he would govern them justly, defend them from their enemies, and restore them to their liberties, rights, and possessions. The aspect of affairs was now quickly changed. John, who had been on the point of overwhelming his haughty barons, was made to tremble for his own safety. The few nobles who had adhered to his cause forsook him and joined his rival, Louis; the people of the north, from Lincolnshire to the borders of Scotland, armed themselves against him; the king of Scotland prepared to march southward to aid in his overthrow; and, as the barons had anticipated, his mercenaries, with the exception of those from Gascony and Poitou, deserted him, and either returned to France or rallied round the standard of Prince Louis. To add to John's misfortunes, at this crisis, his chief supporter—the wily priest who had aided and abetted him in this bloody warfare—the mighty and ambitious Pope Innocent—died, and the church was for some time occupied by the election of a new pontiff: thus leaving John and his barons to settle their quarrel without any further ecclesiastical interference.

John still held the fortresses of England, and the delays in reducing them revived his hopes. Dover Castle was besieged by Louis, and Windsor Castle by the barons. Hubert de Burgh so bravely defended the castle of Dover that Louis was compelled to convert the siege into a blockade; and the barons had to raise the siege of Windsor Castle in order to



CRYPT, BELL TOWER, WINDSOR CASTLE.

repel John, who was marching with his forces to its relief. John fell back on finding the barons were approaching to meet him, and, eluding their pursuit, reached Stamford. The barons then marched to Dover and joined Prince Louis. He had lost much time before the castle of Dover: showing no disposition either to attempt its capture by assault or to give up the enterprise. He also treated the English with marked disrespect, and began to make grants of titles and estates to his French followers. It was the evident design of the protector to become a conqueror. So, according to the chroniclers of the period, said the Viscount de Melun, who had come in the train of Prince Louis. Being seized with a mortal malady in London, De Melun confessed that the French prince meant to destroy those barons who had opposed John, root and branch. Such was the report, and many believed it. There was now, therefore, disunion among the confederates. The earl of Salisbury, John's own brother, had deserted him, and he with other barons now deserted Louis. They withdrew from Dover. They had made a mistake in calling in the aid of a foreign prince; but what step could they now take? They could neither trust King John, nor Prince Louis: both were deceivers. The question was settled by an unlooked-for event. After eluding the barons, who had marched against him from Windsor, John's prospects brightened. He had obtained possession of Lincoln; in the maritime counties several associations had been formed in his favour; and his cruisers had captured considerable supplies sent from the continent for the services of his rival. From Lincoln he marched through Peterborough, and entered the district of Croyland, where he plundered and destroyed the farm-houses belonging to Croyland Abbey. He then proceeded to King's Lynn, and then again turning his face northward, he marched to Wisbeach. The Wash was before him with its sandy bed: an estuary passable at low water, but subject to sudden rises of the tide, which made the passage dangerous. The Romans had made it passable by embanked roads, but these had long since been swept

away by its tidal waters. If John crossed it, it must be over the bed of the estuary. It was a dangerous movement, but he resolved to make it. His march over the Wash commenced at a place called Cross Keys, on the southern side of the Wash, and his army had nearly reached the opposite shore, when the returning tide was seen approaching them with resistless might. John and a portion of his army escaped, but his rear was overtaken, and men, carriages, sumpter horses, treasures, provisions, armour, clothes, and the regalia of the king were swallowed up in a surging whirlpool. John stood on the northern side of the Wash, helpless and despairing. His loss was irretrievable. That terrible surge of the tidal waters of the Wash, mingling in its impetuous ascent with the descending current of the river Welland, was to him as the waters of the Red Sea was to Pharoah—utter ruin. Bitterly cursing his fate, he travelled on to the Cisterican abbey of Swineshead. Fatigue and anguish weighed him down, and in this prostrate condition he ate gluttonously of fruit and drank copious draughts of new-made cider. Fever followed. He spent a night of horrors in the Abbey of Swineshead, and on the following morning he mounted his horse to continue his march. At every step he took the fever increased, and he was compelled to be placed in a litter, in which manner he was conveyed to the castle of Newark on the Trent. His race was run: a confessor was sent for, and he prepared for death. As he lay on his death-bed it is related that some of his barons sent messengers with a proposal to return to their allegiance. But it was too late. The tyrant fever was destroying the tyrant king. He expired on the 19th of October, in the forty-ninth year of his age, and the seventeenth of his most miserable and inglorious reign. He was interred in the cathedral church of Worcester.

The character of King John is the most odious of all the English monarchs. So hateful was his memory to the people for a long period that, in the days of Richard the Second, insurgents against his authority and rule exacted an oath that no king bearing the name of John should again reign in England. As a man he was depraved beyond measure. He was a rebellious son to a fond father; the persecuter of a generous-hearted brother; an unfaithful husband; the murderer of his nephew Arthur; the gaoler of his niece Eleanor; and the despoiler of his subjects. He was a wanton violator of the most solemn oaths; a profane swearer; a wretched adulterer. As a king, he was sometimes a coward, and at others a tyrant. He subjected his kingdom to the ignominious yoke of Rome; he suffered himself to be stripped of his foreign dominions without a struggle; and yet he was at all times ready to revile and outrage the defenceless. Like Nero of old, he was in his element only when he was sporting with the honours, fortunes, and lives of his subjects. Yet while the reign of King John was productive of wide-spread misery to his people, the wise ordering of Providence brought good out of evil. By a paradox his miserable rule produced a blessing to posterity. His tyranny drove the oppressed barons into rebellion, which procured for them the great charter, and for their descendants through all time that precious heritage—British freedom.

A few words concerning the history of Wales during the period to which this section is devoted will suffice. On the accession of Richard the Lion Hearted, the government of North Wales was presided over by David ap Owen, who succeeded to it to the exclusion of Llewellyn, his eldest brother's son. In the year 1194, however, Llewellyn drove him from his throne, and it was in vain that he attempted to recover it. Llewellyn, by his vigorous and wise administration, gained the love of his Welsh subjects, and obtained for himself the pompous but doubtful title of "The Great." Like his ancestors, he made several incursions into England around the borders of Wales, for which John, as before recorded, called him to account, but without much effect. At the death of John he was still living, as honoured and loved by his people as the English monarch was despised and hated. But Llewellyn was not sole monarch of Wales, for there were still many petty chieftains, who were almost always engaged in war against one another or against the English on their borders.

In the present period William the Lion, king of Scotland—who was the contemporary of three kings of England—was more prosperous than he had been in the reign of Henry the Second. In that reign, as before related, he had lost his independence; but Richard the Lion Hearted—before he entered upon his memorable crusade—in order to gain the friendship of the king and people of Scotland, that they might not disturb the peace of his dominions during his absence, and in order to obtain money to aid him in his enterprise, restored William and his kingdom to their former independency. The charter by which this was effected was executed at Canterbury on the 5th of December, A.D. 1189. William paid ten thousand marks for this valuable charter, by which it is clear that Richard gave him an acquittance from all allegiance and subjection for the kingdom of Scotland, only reserving to himself the right of receiving homage from the king of Scotland for his English dignities. With this acquittance William, also, had restored to him the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, which by the treaty of Falaise he had surrendered to King Henry. The wisdom of the step taken by Richard to secure the friendship of William was manifested in the course of his reign. His generous concession so bound the king of Scotland and his people to his interests, that they scorned to join the king of France and Prince John in their schemes against him, when he was imprisoned in the Tyrol by the emperor of Germany, and contributed a considerable sum of money for his ransom. On his return to England, William the Lion visited Richard, and took part in the ceremonies of his second coronation. During that visit William obtained a charter regulating the entertainments of the kings of Scotland in their journeys to and from the court of England, but he failed in obtaining the restitution of the northern counties of Westmoreland, Cumberland, and Northumberland, which he so much desired. With this exception, there was perfect concord between these two monarchs, and that caused no breach of the peace between them. After this, few events of importance mark the remainder of the reign of William the Lion. In A.D. 1196, and the following year, there were insurrections in Caithness and Sunderland, but

hey were quickly suppressed. After the accession of King John to the English crown, William did homage o him in December, A.D. 1290, at Lincoln, for his lands n England, "saving his own rights." At that time William again demanded the restitution of the northern ounties, but, after his usual manner, John required ime to take the matter into consideration; and as he ever did this, but, on the contrary, finally attempted o erect a fort at Tweedmouth, there was a quarrel etween the two monarchs. William demolished the ort at Tweedmouth, and in the year 1209 John adranced to Norham with his forces, and William narched at the head of an army to Berwick. But here was no fighting. By the intervention of the nobles, the two monarchs met at Norham, and a treaty f peace was concluded, the conditions of which are hrouded in mystery. All that is really known is that William bound himself to pay to John fifteen thousand marks, and that he by the treaty delivered his two daughters to John, that he might provide for them suitable matches. But the question is, for what was the money payment made, and the princesses delivered into the hands of the English monarch? By some it is supposed that it was for the demolition of the fort at Tweedmouth, which John undertook not to rebuild; while others contend the conditions were—what an English Parliament thirty years after asserted —that the two princesses were to be married to the two sons of King John, and that the money, together with a renunciation of his claim to the northern counties, was given by William as their marriage portion. This latter would appear to have been the case, inasmuch as Alexander, the son and successor of William, is distinctly stated to have renewed the claim to the northern counties, and to have demanded the repayment of the fifteen thousand marks, because the stipulations of the treaty had not been performed. William died after a lingering illness at Stirling, A.D. 1214, in the seventy-second year of his age and the forty-ninth year of his reign, and was succeeded by his only legitimate son, Alexander, by Errmengarde de Beaumont, who was crowned at Scone, being at that time in the seventeenth year of his age. As the English barons who were at war with their king engaged to surrender to him the northern counties, Alexander espoused their cause; thus bringing down upon himself the vengeance of King John, as before related. And at the close of this period he had, after marching an army through England, and plundering the estates of those barons who adhered to John, joined Louis at Dover, to whom he paid homage for all his lands in England, and especially for the three counties to which he, in common with his ancestors, laid claim as an integral portion of the kingdom of Scotland. On his return from Dover, Alexander met with opposition, in passing the Trent, from the forces of King John, from which, however, he was relieved by the death of that monarch at Newark.

CHAPTER II.

History of Laws and Government, from the Conquest, A.D. 1066, to the Death of King John, A.D. 1216.

SECTION I.

Classes of Society. The Norman conquest was not, as some have supposed, a resistless deluge, sweeping away all pre-existing usages, and introducing a new order of things. Great changes are only brought about in the lapse of time, not by the sword in a moment. A glance at the ranks and degrees of men in society will prove that the changes which took place in them were rather nominal than real. Thus the Anglo-Saxon serfs who, during the Saxon rule, had been annexed to the lands which they cultivated, and had been usually transferred from one proprietor to another when those lands were bestowed by William on his Norman barons, still continued slaves as heretofore. The greatest change appears to have been in their condition and numbers; for the Norman conquerors for some time treated their English slaves with great severity, and reduced many freemen taken in battle to a state of slavery. But all slaves under the Norman rule were not equally abject and wretched. There were different degrees of slavery, and different kinds of slaves. Thus there were domestic slaves, who performed the most degrading and laborious offices about their masters' houses; praedial slaves, who cultivated the land to which they were annexed, and who had an interest in their houses and furniture, and in small plots of land, which they were allowed to cultivate for their own subsistence; Cottars, who practised some handicraft or trade, as that of smiths or carpenters, for their masters' benefit; and Borders, who appear to have been a kind of upper domestic servants, who waited at table and performed other offices in their masters' houses, and who resided in cottages of their own, to which plots of land were annexed as the reward for their services. All children born of slaves were in the same degree of subjection to the same masters as their parents; and had not many from time to time obtained their freedom, and others exported and sold in foreign countries, this order of men must have become a burden rather than a benefit to their owners. That many of them obtained their freedom is certain; some through their fidelity and diligence, which, exciting the gratitude of their masters, induced them to set them free; others through the good offices of the clergy; and others by the voluntary acts of penitents, who released them from bondage "for the good of their souls." The ceremony of manumission was usually performed at church or at the county court, when the master, taking his

slave by the hand, declared that he gave him his freedom, and having given him a sword or a spear—the arms of a freeman, which no slave was allowed to handle—ordered the doors to be thrown open that he might go where he pleased. Slaves thus set free occupied the same place in society as those of the times of the Anglo-Saxons.

In the middle ranks of society there were three classes of men formerly distinct, which during this period became united. These were the *Sochemanni* or *Socmen*, a class of inferior landowners, who held lands under a lord, and who owed suit and service in the lord's court, but whose tenure was permanent; Anglo-Saxon nobles and thanes who were degraded from their former rank and divested of all power, but permitted to retain their ancient possessions under the protection of the Norman barons; and those Normans and other foreigners who fought under their several leaders in the conquest of England, and who settled on the demesne lands of their leaders and became their *socmen*, farmers, and lower vassals. It was with this class of society that the towns and cities were generally inhabited, and it was from this class that the yeomanry and many of the English gentry are generally descended.

The highest order of the state was that of the Norman barons. These were the great vassals and immediate tenants of the crown—tenants *in capite*, or chief, as they were called. One of the leading duties of these vassals was that of military knight service. After his conquest, the politic William divided the whole country into about sixty thousand knights' fees: the tenant of each of which being bound, when required by his liege lord, to keep the field at his own expense for forty days. The ordinance by which this great principle of feudal knight service was established, reads thus:—"We command that all earls, barons, knights, sergeants, and freeman, be always ready to perform to us their whole service in manner as they owe it to us of right for their fees and tenements, as we have appointed to them by the common council of our whole kingdom, and as we have granted to them in fee with right of inheritance." The Norman barons, therefore, comprehended all the considerable proprietors of land in England—land which they held direct from the crown, and for which they not only rendered homage to the king, but were bound to do him suit and service in the field, both at home and abroad, whenever their services were required. They were the spiritual and temporal lords in the kingdom—lords who enjoyed many privileges and immunities, and who in their own territories were a kind of petty princes, possessing both civil and military jurisdiction over their sub-vassals.

Government.—Although the conquest was not followed by any great changes in the ranks and orders of men in society, it produced many important changes in the government. The basis of that government was feudalism. The foundations of the feudal system had been laid in England in a prior age, but it was fully introduced and universally established by William the Conqueror. If he did not erect the mighty fabric he put on its topstone. Having by the battle of Hastings, and subsequent military operations, obtained possession of the larger portion of land in England, he was thereby enabled to establish the feudal system government in its fullest extent. Nor did he neglect his opportunity. It was for this that he ordered the survey recorded in the Doomsday Book, and that survey completed, he set himself to work in earnest to perfect feudalism. Retaining numerous manors, parks, forests, chases, farms, and houses in all parts of the kingdom for himself, he distributed the remainder to his various chieftains who had aided him in obtaining the English crown. These were distributed according to the different degrees of their power, their services, and their favour. William was most lavish in giving that which was really not his own to some of those who accompanied him to England. Thus his sister's son, Hugh de Abrencis, was favoured with the gift of the whole county of Chester; Robert, earl of Montaigne, with nine hundred and seventy-three manors; Oda, bishop of Bayeux, with four hundred and thirty-nine; Allan, earl of Brittany, with four hundred and forty-two; William de Warrenne, with two hundred and ninety-eight; and Roger Bigod, with one hundred and twenty-three. Walter Giffard, Richard de Clare, and William de Percy, were also large recipients of William's bounty, and others of less note had no reason to complain that he was niggardly. But the grants made by William were not unconditional. There was a variety of obligations attached to all of them. First, they were to pay him homage and fealty for their estates. And this was not a slight matter in those days of feudalism. The sovereign of a feudal kingdom never appeared in greater glory than when in his court of parliament he received the homage of his vassals. As he sat upon his throne, with his crown on his head, his greatest prelates and most powerful barons, uncovered and unarmed, knelt before him, and in that attitude, as they put their hands between his, they swore "to be his liege men of life and limb and worldly worship, to bear faith and troth to him," and "to live and die with him against all manner of men." The vassals of a feudal monarch were also to attend his court at the three great festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and in his parliament. They were likewise to render him services in the field, and to defend his castles with a certain number of men, according to the extent of their manors or estates; and they were to make pecuniary prestations of various kinds to him as their lord for the support of his regal dignity. For though William, and succeeding feudal sovereigns, made grants of lands to their vassals, they did not relinquish all rights in them. On the contrary, they still considered them as their own peculiar heritage. The right of using those lands was granted only on certain conditions. Thus they reserved to themselves certain annual payments as rents. Then, again, if any vassal of the crown died and left his heir under age, the king took possession of his estate, and acted as guardian of the heir, whether male or female, by which means considerable profits were brought into the royal coffers, and favourites were enriched by being appointed to the guardianship of wards. Female wards could not marry without the king's consent, and heiresses were often exposed to sale, or compelled to purchase the liberty of disposing of themselves in marriage by bestowing large sums of money either on the king personally or on some courtier to

whom he had granted or sold his consent to the marriage. Nor was this all the benefits derived by the crown from the guardianship of such minors, for when they came of age they were called upon to pay a certain sum of money before they could take their estates into their own hands. Moreover, heirs who were of age at the death of their progenitors were compelled to pay "Reliefs" or heriots, which were often arbitrary and oppressive. Another prestation, or payment, was called *Scutage* or shield money, to which both the clergy and the laity were subjected: that is, if they were not able or willing to serve in the field, or failed to provide a substitute, they had to pay a fee; a payment sometimes called for unjustly, as the Norman kings did not scruple to pretend to engage in an expedition into distant parts, or at inconvenient seasons, that they might obtain *Scutage* from their vassals. On certain occasions "aids" were demanded from the vassals of the crown, such as the knighting of the king's eldest son, the marriage of his eldest daughter, and the ransoming his person if made prisoner in his wars. All this shows that though the great vassals of the crown may be considered absolute proprietors, holding their lands in perpetuity, yet these feudal monarchs considered them as tenants "in fee." It is further shown that he had power over the lands, in the fact that if the feoffee committed felony or treason, or if the race of the original feoffee became extinct, then they reverted to the crown.

All these sources of revenue, together with the sale of public offices, and of the royal protection and justice, accured to the Norman kings an independent power, against which no single vassal could hope to withstand. The servitudes which the barons were called upon to render were often oppressive, but they were not the only persons who suffered under this feudal system of government. As the king acted towards them, so did they act towards their vassals. Imitating the example of their sovereign, they disposed of their lands to their followers who had fought under their banners, on terms similar to those on which they had received them from the crown, retaining those parts only called demesnes which lay contiguous to their castles. And these vassals were made to feel the weight of the feudal servitude which they themselves felt. They paid their lords homage, they attended their courts, they followed them into the field with a certain number of men, and they were subjected to exactly the same prestations or money payments as the barons were to the king. A feudal baron was, in truth, a little king, and his barony a kingdom within a kingdom. And this system was carried still lower down; for the vassals of barons granted subinfeudations on the same plan, by which means the servitudes of the feudal system were felt by every possessor of land held by military tenure from the highest to the lowest. The *socmen*—probably those who followed the *soc* or plough—were not, it is true, subjected to the feudal servitudes of attendance on those of whom they held their lands, nor of wardship, marriage, &c., inasmuch as they were held in contempt by the state, but they were subjected to servitude more exacting and laborious, for they had to furnish men, horses, and carriages on various occasions, and to plough and sow the lands of their lords. Thus it is clear that under the feudal system of government legal exactions were made the source of oppression and injustice. The crown oppressed its baron vassals, the barons their vassals, and the barons' vassals their inferior tenants. The state of inheritance, therefore, which appeared to be generous and equitable, was, on the contrary, a perpetual grievance. The possessor of lands could neither transmit them by will nor transfer them by sale; they were theirs only so long as they fulfilled the conditions under which they were granted. And if the freemen were oppressed in the tenure of their property, the landless men suffered still more. If in the Saxon period they committed an offence they paid a mulct; if in the Norman, they were subjected to an *amerciament*. Their personal estates were at the mercy of their lords.

The feudal system produced other changes in government. Thus, the constitution of the Anglo-Saxon courts of justice was supplanted by others of an essentially different character. Three kinds of persons only bore the chief sway, both in peace and war: the kings, the barons, and the earls. Each of these had their courts, in which justice was, or ought to have been, administered. The chief court of the kingdom was that of the king. It was called *curia*, or *aula regis*, because it was held in the great hall of the king's palace, wherever he happened to reside. The king was always presumed to be present in this court, either in person or by his representatives, the judges of his court, to whom he committed the performance of his duty and the exercise of his prerogative as the supreme judge in his kingdom. The judges were the great officers of the crown, the king's justices, and the great barons, both spiritual and temporal, of the kingdom. The great officers of the crown were the chief justiciary, the constable of England, the mareschal or marshal, the high steward, the chamberlain, the chancellor, and the treasurer. These great officers not only attended to the hearing and decision of causes between suitors, but each in his department to all the public business which is understood at present to fall under the province of a cabinet of ministers; that is, they fulfilled the judicial as well as the administrative office. The king's judges were men trained to a knowledge of the law, and appear to have been appointed chiefly to inform the other members of the king's court what the law of the land was in every case; just as one of the legal profession of the present day is supposed to be the guide in the decisions of the unpaid magistracy of the kingdom. There were several chambers in the king's court, and certain judges sat in each of them to take cognizance of those matters with which they were best acquainted. The jurisdiction of this supreme court was universal, and for a long period extended over all the subjects in the kingdom; but in the end the clergy in a great measure emancipated themselves from its authority, a circumstance, as unfolded in previous pages, which led to a contest between the church and the crown.

As the king's court was held in the hall of his palace, so the court of the baron was held in the hall of his castle. The baron was not only the commander of his tenants in war, but their judge in time of peace. He administered justice to his vassals either in person or by his bailiff, not only compelling the payment of

debts, and the performance of contracts, but redressing wrongs, and even punishing crimes with death. All who held baronies of the crown, whether clerical or lay, were obliged to hold these courts; and the barons of barons, or those who held manors under them, presided over similar courts; but *they* had not the power of inflicting capital punishment.

The court in which the earl presided was the county court, which in the Anglo-Saxon period, and during some part of the reign of William the Conquror, was one of great power and dignity. The bishop sat in judgment with the earl, and all the abbots, priors, barons, knights, and freeholders of the county were compelled to attend. But this splendour did not long continue. About the year 1085 William separated the ecclesiastical from the civil parts of the court, by prohibiting the bishops to sit as judges, the clergy to attend as suitors, and the causes of the church to be tried in them. From that time the power and splendour of the county court rapidly declined. After the departure of the bishops and clergy, the earls refused to attend as judges, and the barons as suitors, and the county court became almost deserted. It was this separation of the ecclesiastic from the civic part of these courts which led to the emancipation of the clergy from the king's court, for William having allowed them to have courts of their own, they finally put them under the protection of the sovereign pontiff; thus setting the crown and the mitre at fatal variance.

The courts under the Norman rule were proverbially corrupt. Justice, or what passed for justice, was bought and sold in them universally. Even the supreme court of judicature was only open to those who brought presents. Money was demanded by the very barons of the exchequer—a chamber in the king's court so called from a chequered cloth which covered the table—and the proceedings of all the courts were ruled by gold. It is related that those who had money enough might compound for all sorts of capital offences, while for those who had none there was neither justice nor mercy.

The supreme legislative power of England—that of making new laws and imposing new taxes—was lodged in the king and great council, or what was subsequently called parliamentum, from the French word *parler*, "to speak." Who were the members of the great councils or parliamentums of this period is not clearly defined. That all archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls, and barons who held an entire barony by grant from the king, were constituted members, there can be no question. For some time after the Conquest these tenants alone composed the legislative assembly of the kingdom. It would appear, however, that at a later date others who held smaller portions of land immediately of the king, and who were called the lesser barons, or free military tenants of the crown, became members of the great council. This is demonstrated by the fourteenth article of the Great Charter of King John, which reads thus:—"To have a common council of the kingdom we will cause to be summoned the archbishops, bishops, earls, and greater barons, particularly by our letters; and, besides, we will cause to be summoned in general by our sheriffs and bailiffs all those who hold of us in *capite*." Historians of the period occasionally speak of gr multitudes both of the clergy and laity being pres at some of the councils, but these it would rat appear were spectators and not members of t assembly. It is clear, indeed, that those only w were summoned had a right to take part in the de berations of the council, although the spectators, as a great council held at Westminster A.D. 1128, sor times ventured to interrupt and even set aside t debates.

By the introduction of the feudal system the Norm kings acquired a large accession of power, as th several histories manifest. This power was in a gr measure supported by their enormous revenues; besides the revenues derived from their royal demesn and from the rents, aids, wardships, marriages, a scutages of the vassals, money flowed into the coffe of the Norman monarchs from a variety of oth sources. In the year 1083 William is said to hav revived the odious Danegeld—the old Saxon land ta —and to have advanced it to six shillings on eac hide of land, a rate at which it would have produce £80,000, an amount of silver equal in value t £240,000 of our present money. This tax was no annual; but it appears to have been collected either under the name of land tax, or some other, from time to time by the succeeding kings of the period. A species of house tax is mentioned in the Doomsday Book under the name of hearth-money, but this seems to have been collected both before and after the Conquest. Another species of hearth-money was of Norman origin. This was called moneyage, and it consisted of a tax of a shilling on each hearth, payable every three years, as a recompense to the king for the non-exercise of his privilege in altering or debasing the coin of the realm. Another permanent tax consisted of the tallages, or cuttings, from the French word *tailler*, "to cut," which was a certain assessment upon their property annually exacted from the inhabitants of all towns and boroughs. But the first general personal tax was imposed A.D. 1166, by Henry II., for the support of the war in Palestine. This tax was only levied during five years at that time; and it was renewed A.D. 1188, on the news of the expulsion of the Crusaders from the Holy City, and the amount levied was a tenth of the personal property of all those who would not, or did not, join the expedition which it was proposed to send to rescue the city from the victorious Saracens. Another species of general taxation was introduced by Richard the Lion Hearted, under the form of a scheme for the sale of licences; that is, all those who wished to engage in the exercise of the tournament had to pay so many marks before they were permitted to enter the lists. Additional revenues were obtained by means of various prerogatives attached to the crown. One of these was called purveyance, a prerogative by which the kings of the period possessed the right of purchasing whatever they required for their courts and castles before any one else was served. This was often a source of great injury to the people, and of great profit to the crown. The purveyors, indeed, were frequently mere plunderers, not even paying for the goods which they purchased, and if they did pay, it was at a price below their value. Other revenues were derived from tolls and

dues exacted at public fairs and markets; from the coining of money: from fines and amercements paid by persons convicted of breaches of the law; from the grants of patents and monopolies; from the sale of privileges of all kinds; and from the sale of vacant ecclesiastical benefices. Other revenues were derived from payments made to the king to purchase his direct interference with law proceedings; and to obtain the right of being tried by a jury. Fines were also often paid for permission to hold or quit offices; and in some reigns offices were sold to the highest bidder. No office either in church or state could be obtained without a bribe, and it appears to have been customary when any bribe was paid to the king that an acknowledgment of smaller amount, called "queen's gold," should be given to his consort. Add to all these the irregular sources of revenue which were obtained by extortion and robbery—both from Jew and Christian—the annual returns which flowed into the royal treasury of the Anglo-Norman monarchs must have savoured of the fabulous. Ordericus, who was a contemporary of William the Conqueror, distinctly states that the daily income of that monarch was £1061, a sum equivalent to about £16,000 of our money, or nearly six millions per annum. A similar sum appears to have been collected in the reign of King Richard, for Hoveden relates that when Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, resigned his office of high justiciary, A.D. 1196, he proved that the revenues collected in two years amounted to eleven hundred thousand marks of silver, which was equivalent to eleven million pounds sterling. It was their large revenues that enabled the Anglo-Norman monarchs to maintain the unrivalled splendour of their courts; to entertain their prelates and barons at the three great festivals of the church; to carry on their numerous and expensive wars; to endow monasteries; to erect castles and churches; and to leave the enormous sum of money which history records they had heaped up for those who came after them. Hence it was that when they died one of the first cares of a successor to the throne was to obtain possession of the royal treasury

SECTION II.

Laws.—When William the Conqueror was crowned king of England he took a solemn oath that he would "keep and establish right laws and prevent rapine and injustice." He does not, however, appear to have felt himself bound by his oath to support the laws which he found established. No sooner had he become certain that his crown was secured to him, than he commenced a system of introducing the laws and customs of his native country into his new kingdom. And in this he found no great difficulty, for not only were Normans placed in all the high offices of the church, but in the state likewise. All the judges and pleaders in all the courts of England were Normans. One of the natural consequences of this radical change was the introduction of the Norman or French language into those courts: that being the only language which the Norman judges and pleaders could speak, or write, or understand. The very clerks and scribes of the courts were Normans, and all legal deeds and charters were consequently written in the French language. These deeds and charters were not confirmed as in the Anglo-Saxon period, by the subscriptions of witnesses with the sign of the cross prefixed to each of their names, but by seals impressed *upon* or attached *to* them.

It has been seen that the principle of the Anglo-Saxon mode of trial was the submission of the matter in dispute to the ordeal of fire and water. That was held to be the arbitration of heaven—the infallible judgment of the deity. Early in the Norman period another mode of trial was introduced: that of judicial combat or duel. But this, like the ordeal of fire and water, was an appeal to the judgment of God for the discovery of guilt or innocence, and of right or wrong, it being founded on the same supposition as the ordeal of fire and water—that heaven would decide the cause by giving the victory to the champions of innocence and truth. But as the judicial combat was esteemed the most rational and honourable, it soon superseded the old Saxon mode of trial. All disputes among knights and barons, both in criminal and civil causes, were determined by it. If the combatants were the immediate vassals of the crown, the duel was fought in the presence of the king, the constable and mareschal being the judges; but if they were the vassals of a baron, he presided over the combat. Laws were enacted for the regulation of the times, places, and modes of such judicial combats; which, after all, were equally as unsatisfactory in their issues as the trial by fire and water. True it was believed that heaven would not allow the issue to depend upon the thews and sinews and skill of the combatants, but would, if necessary, defend the right by enabling the weaker to overcome the strong; but that belief was founded on the working of a miracle, just as in the case of the old Saxon ordeal.

The judicial combat of this period may be illustrated by a trial which took place A.D. 1158, between Henry de Essex and Robert de Montfort. Essex was the hereditary standard bearer of England, and in a battle fought in Wales he threw away his standard, and exclaimed that King Henry was slain. De Montfort accused him with having done this treasonably, and offered to prove his accusation by judicial combat. The challenge was accepted, and the combat took place before the king and all his court. Essex was defeated, and expected to be immediately executed on De Montfort's charge of treason, but Henry was no admirer, and appears to have had no great faith in this mode of trial, for he spared his life. His estates, however, were confiscated, and Henry made this hereditary standard bearer of England a monk in the Abbey of Reading.

A wiser mode of trial was at this period coming into vogue: that of trial by jury. Such a mode of trial had prevailed in Scandinavia in remote ages, and had been introduced into England by William the Conqueror, but as it was not established by any positive enactment, and as the martial spirit of the age was strongly in favour of the judicial combat, it only came into use by slow degrees. In the reign of Henry I., however, a law was made which gave a great impetus to its progress. By that law judicial combat was not set aside, for the age was not sufficiently enlightened to see its positive absurdity;

but it was enacted that a defendant might either in a criminal or civil process choose either one of two alternatives: either to fight a duel or have his cause decided by a jury of twelve men, called the "grand assize." The rationality of this mode of trial was acknowledged even in those unenlightened times, and it became more and more adopted, until at length it became the prominent feature in English jurisprudence. The victory, however, which "trial by jury" obtained over the judicial combat was not consummated during the Norman period.

During the reign of William the Conqueror the basis of the laws in usage appears to have been founded on the laws of Edward the Confessor. There is, indeed, still extant a charter or body of laws which he is said to have granted to the English people, being, according to its title, the same which Williams' predecessor and cousin, King Edward, observed before him. These recognise all the main features of the Saxon system, and especially the principal of pecuniary compensation for personal injuries. The system of frankpledge, also, continued for some time after the Conquest to be strictly enforced. It might have been dangerous to his rule if William had made sweeping changes in the law before his throne was established, and even after his power was based on a sure foundation, it was necessary to be cautious. But that he did make considerable changes before he died is certain, for the general features and characters of the English law became during his reign more Norman than Saxon. The chief interest of the legislation of this period, however, centres in the charters granted by the Anglo-Norman kings: charters which are usually regarded as the bulwarks of English liberty. The first charter granted was that by which the laws of Edward the Confessor were confirmed by William the Conqueror; which, according to some of the old chroniclers, was in the year 1070. But it would rather appear from Ingulphus, who was an intimate friend and favourite of the Conqueror, that his sanction to these laws, for which the English people entertained an undying love, was not given till a later period, for that writer distinctly affirms that he brought with him from London to his monastery, A.D. 1081, certain laws of the most righteous King Edward, which his "illustrious lord King William had promulgated as perpetual and authentic, and to be inviolably observed through the whole Kingdom of England under the severest penalties." At the same time the laws, which William is said to have sanctioned, according to Eadmerus, were not altogether those of King Edward, for he distinctly states that certain additions were made to them "for the benefit of the English." The second charter was granted by Henry I. soon after his coronation. Many of the enactments of this charter have reference to the relations of feudalism, but one of its clauses expressly restores the laws of Edward the Confessor, which had been but ill observed, with those emendations his father, by the advice of his barons, had made in them. It would appear by this, then, that the Red King William had further tampered with the laws of the Confessor, his amendments being, no doubt, of pure Norman origin. But most of the engagements contained in the charter of Henry were never duly performed. Notwithstanding, the charter was of great importance, inasmuch as it served in many essential particulars for the model of that which the barons extorted from King John. It is said, indeed, that when they took up arms their demand was that those rights and liberties should be conceded to the church and kingdom, which were contained in the laws of Edward the Confessor and in the charter of King Henry. The usurper, Stephen, granted two charters, one to the barons and the other to the clergy, and the Second Henry granted another, all of which were brief and chiefly confined to a renewal of the promises before made, but which were only renewed to be broken again and again. It was the non-observance of these charters by the Anglo-Norman monarchs that finally induced the barons to draw their swords in defence of their rights and liberties. Under their first kings, they had not the power to undertake the struggle; but when at length the sceptre fell into the hands of an imbecile and coward, they undertook it and succeeded: Magna Charta being, as before recorded, signed by King John on the 15th of June, A.D. 1215.

The enactments of this famous deed either granted or secured to every order of men in the kingdom—the clergy, the barons, and the people—very important liberties and privileges. To the clergy it secured the freedom of elections, and it removed from them all check upon appeals to Rome, and ordained that all fines imposed upon them for any offence should be proportioned to their lay estates and not to their ecclesiastical benefices. The privileges granted to the barons were either abatements in the rigour of the feudal law, or determinations in points of that law hitherto arbitrary and ambiguous. Thus it limited the royal practice of exacting sums under the name of reliefs; of wasting the estates of wards: of disposing in marriage of heirs during their minority; and, also, of heiresses and widows. Scutages were to be estimated at the same rate as in the time of Henry I., and no scutage or aid except in the three general feudal cases—the king's captivity, the knighting of his eldest son, and the marriage of his eldest daughter—was to be imposed, and then not by the king, but by the great council of the nation. Then, again, the king was not to claim the wardship of any minor who held lands by military tenure of a baron, on pretence that he held lands of the crown by soccage or any other tenure; nor was the king to seize any baron's land for a debt to the crown, if there were sufficient goods and chattels to pay the debt. At the same time, the barons agreed that every liberty and custom granted to them by the charter, should be observed by them towards their vassals. Such were its principal clauses as regards the barons in relation to the crown, and in relation to their subtenants. The rights of the freemen of the kingdom were provided for in the following provisions:—"The Court of Common Pleas shall not follow the King's Court, but shall be held in a certain fixed place. Justice shall not be sold, refused, or delayed to any one. We, or if we are absent from the kingdom, our chief justiciary shall send four times a year into each county two judges, who, with four knights chosen by each county, shall hold the assizes at the time and place appointed in the said county. No

shall be arrested or imprisoned or dispossessed enement, or outlawed, or exiled, or in anywise ed against unless by the legal judgment of s, or by the law of the land. No freeman, or t, or villain, shall be unreasonably fined for a ffence; the first shall not be deprived of his t; the second of his merchandise; the third implements of husbandry." By the charter, d upright judges were to be appointed, and an unjustly arrested was to be re-instated in essions. Finally, no one was to be compelled e or support bridges but by ancient custom; reeman was to be at liberty to dispose of his cording to his will; and no officer of the crown was to take away horses, carts, or wood without the owner's consent. Such were the leading features of Magna Charta. It was not a revolution but a conservative reform, built, as all English freedom has been built, upon a foundation laid in former ages. It was a wholesome redress of long endured mal-administration. Every Norman king who had taken the coronation oath had promised to observe similar provisions to those which it contained, but the Great Charta made that oath—hitherto mere words—a binding reality. The rights of monarchy was not destroyed by it, but only limited; while it formed a basis for the preservation of the liberty of the subject.

CHAPTER III.

The History of Religion, from the Conquest, A.D. 1066., to the Death of King John, A.D. 1216.

SECTION I.

nquest was not followed by any material change onstitution of the English Church. The same edience was paid by the Norman kings to the n pontiff as the Anglo-Saxon monarchs had fore them. But although the constitution of urch was not materially changed, there was a g change among those who ministered at the No sooner was William the Conqueror seated throne, than he seems to have formed a design iving the most eminent of the English clergy dignities in order to bestow them on his men. In this he was willingly assisted by the William having requested the assistance of o remodel the English church, on the pretence affairs were in great disorder, certain cardinal were despatched to England for the purpose dying the so-called disorders by which it was be afflicted. Accordingly, in the year 1070, a was held in the presence of William at ster, in which Stigand, archbishop of Canterne bishop of Norwich, and several abbots were ; and in another council, held at Windsor in ne year, the bishop of Chichester and several bots shared the same fate. Alarmed at these es, the bishops of Durham and Lincoln fled otland, and by these depositions and resignand by the deaths of other English prelates, the English sees became vacant, and were all rith the king's favourite foreigners; Lanfranc, f Caen, becoming archbishop of Canterbury, omas, canon of Bayeux, archbishop of York. ranc was nearly ninety years of age when he vited to the archbishopric of Canterbury. It ed that he at first refused the dignity, because ignorant of the language of the "English ans," but that at the earnest request of William, by the exhortations of the pope, he assumed h office. The Conqueror could not have chosen a more fitting instrument than Lanfranc to carry out the species of reformation which he resolved to introduce into the church. His elevation was followed by a general substitution of a native for a foreign clergy. Some, with good reason, were ejected on the ground of ignorance and immorality; but others ejected were men of learning and piety, and equally deserving of their livings as the foreigners on whom they were bestowed. In the absence of more substantial charges, some were ejected because they were Englishmen, and could not speak the Norman language; the very reason, why, if the spiritual interests of the community was a matter of consideration, they should still have been allowed to minister at the altar. But that was not the object of the Conqueror. His desire was to convert the spiritual estate to a community of interest and feeling with the civil government, which could never have been effected so long as there was an English clergy in the realm. That was his object, and in a few years it was generally attained. By ejectments, by voluntary exile, and by the relinquishment of the sacred office, the church was pretty well cleared of a native clergy, and the Normans filled their pulpits.

The reign of William the Conqueror was marked by a contest with the famous Hildebrand, who, in the year 1673, became pontiff, under the name of Gregory VII. Hildebrand claimed supreme dominion over all Christendom, and attempted to subject all emperors, kings, and princes to his authority. A legate was sent into England to assert his title to that kingdom, and to demand an oath of fealty from the Conqueror, together with the payment of all arrears of Peter's pence, which he affected to call tribute. William the Conqueror bow before a haughty priest! He who exercised the privileges of a victor in the church become a vassal to that church! His proud spirit could not brook the idea: he hurled defiance at the chair of St. Peter. He would send, he said, the Peter's pence, like his predecessors, as a

free gift, not as tribute; but as for paying homage for his kingdom, he rejected the demand with scorn. He further mortified the pride and resisted the pretensions of the haughty Hildebrand by refusing his permission for Lanfranc, who had been commanded to repair to Rome, to leave the kingdom. It was in vain that the pontiff threatened him with the vengeance of St. Peter: he heeded him not. On the contrary, taking advantage of a quarrel between Hildebrand and the Emperor of Germany, and of his remoteness from Rome, he commenced a vigorous warfare against the papal encroachments. He ordered that no pontiff should be acknowledged in England without his sanction; that all papal letters should be submitted to him for inspection before they were published; that no decision, either of national or provincial synod, should be carried into execution without his sanction; and that the clergy should not presume either to implead or excommunicate any tenant holding lands of the crown without his permission. But the greatest change which William made in the Church of England was towards the close of his reign, when he separated the Ecclesiastical from the Civil Courts, which in the Anglo-Saxon period had been closely united. The inflexible sternness of William checked the march of papal usurpation in England, though only for a season.

Lanfranc appears to have stood aloof from the quarrel between William and Hildebrand, although it is clear, eminent as he was for his attainments—for he was the restorer and patron of letters—that his sympathies went with the sovereign pontiff. In heart, he was no less devoted to the supremacy of Rome than the famous St. Dunstan. He laboured earnestly to inflict celibacy upon the clergy: he advocated the doctrine of the corporeal presence in the sacrament, a dogma scarcely heard of in the Anglo-Saxon church; and he was by no means scrupulous in the use of that machinery by which superstition can maintain its ascendancy. It can scarcely be imagined, therefore, that Lanfranc viewed with any degree of pleasure his patron's hostility to the sovereign pontiff; but William was not a man to be controlled by a priest, however he might venerate him for his sacred calling. Throughout his reign he exercised supremacy over the church with a high hand, and he made not only changes in its polity, but in its revenues. Thus, finding that the clergy and monasteries possessed too great a proportion of the riches of the kingdom, he stripped them of many of their estates, and subjected those they still retained to the same military services and feudal prestations as those of his barons.

Lanfranc survived his patron, and at his death, A.D. 1089, William Rufus was in no hurry to appoint a successor. For nearly five years he kept the possessions of the see of Canterbury, during which time it was in vain that the clergy importuned him to give them a primate. At length, however, in the prospect of death from a dangerous sickness, he appointed Anselm, abbot of Beck, in Normandy, to the vacant see. Anselm was in England when Rufus resolved to create a new archbishop, and he was hurried to his bedside to receive the crozier. It is said that he refused to touch the sacred staff, and that it was forced into his hand by the royal attendants, "wh all, with one accord, burst forth into a *Te Deum* t the primate whom heaven had sent them." Anselm reluctance to accept the dignity appears to have aris more from a fear of the Red King's rapacious temp than from a feeling of unworthiness. "The Chur of England," he said, "should be drawn by animals equal strength; but they were yoking to the plou a feeble old sheep with a mad young bull that wou tear its companion through every obstacle, and final drag it to death." But Anselm's character was by means so gentle as his representation of it would i dicate. If William's temper was fiery, his was ster and obstinate. The seeds of dissension were sow between them at the very commencement of thei connexion. Upon his acceptation of the office, Anselm stipulated that the church lands belonging to his se should be restored, and that the king should pa implicit obedience to his advice in spiritual matters William led him to believe that these condition should be fulfilled; but no sooner had he left his bed of sickness than he resumed the plunder of the church with fresh vigour. Whenever the Red King conferred the higher benefices on his clergy, he looked for a valuable consideration, and Anselm offered him five hundred pounds, but it was refused. William demanded a thousand; and when Anselm declared that he could not raise such a sum from his exhausted revenues, the king declared that he would never acknowledge him for his archbishop. From that time there was open war between the "mad young bull," and the "feeble old sheep." Anselm further incensed the monarch by reproving him and his courtiers for their long hair, gaudy dress, and effeminate manners; and by pressing him too closely to call a council of the clergy, and to fill up the vacant abbeys. After this, William went to Normandy, but when he returned, the breach between him and his primate became wider. It was the custom of newly-appointed archbishops to go to Rome to receive the pall, and Anselm desired to go thither for that purpose. At this time, however, there were two rival popes—Urban and Clement—and the Red King had not yet acknowledged either. Anselm was, therefore, asked to which pope he meant to go, and on his answering "Urban," William indignantly exclaimed that he might as well tear the crown from his head as to dispossess him of a right which was the peculiar prerogative of the English kings. Anselm still pressed for permission to set out on his journey, and a council of the nobility and prelates was called at Rockingham, in March, A.D. 1095, to consider the matter in dispute. That council decided that the primate's conduct was illegal, and persuaded him to retract his decision in favour of Urban, and to forego his wish to undertake the journey; but he would make no concession. Urban was the pontiff of his choice, and from his hands, and his only, would he receive the pall. The quarrel grew hotter and hotter. Anselm was required to resign his see, but although he had been reluctant to accept it, he was still more reluctant to resign it: he would still be archbishop. To rid himself of Anselm, the Red King now had recourse to artifice. Envoys were sent to Rome to make an offer to Urban to acknowledge him as pope if

he would consent to the refractory primate's deposition, and send William a pall to be bestowed on whom he pleased. Desirous of having the king of England on his side, Urban promised everything, and sent a legate into England with a pall; but when William had issued a proclamation commanding all his subjects to acknowledge Urban II. as pope, the legate declared that the pope would not consent to the deposition of so good a son of the church of Rome as Anselm, and that he had received orders to deliver it to him, which he accordingly did with great pomp in the cathedral of Canterbury. William was outwitted, and he was enraged at the perfidious conduct of the court of Rome; but as he was engaged in an expedition to Normandy, he postponed his resentment.

On William's return, his quarrel with Anselm was renewed. As many of the chief offices of the church were still vacant, the primate pressed that they might be conferred upon proper persons. "Are not the abbeys mine?" asked Rufus. "Do what you please with the farms of your archbishopric, but leave me the same liberty to do what I will with my own." Anselm felt that the kingdom was growing too hot to hold him; and under the plea that he wanted to go to Rome for the good of his soul and the benefit of the church, he again desired the king's permission to undertake that journey. Permission was refused, and if he went without, he was told that his departure would be followed by confiscation and banishment. Anselm had a burning desire to go to Rome to pour his griefs into the ears of the Holy Father; and, notwithstanding William's threats, in the spring of A.D. 1098 Anselm set out on foot as a humble pilgrim, with staff and wallet, to Rome. On discovering his departure the Red King was as good as his word: he seized all the revenues of Canterbury and declared all the acts of Anselm to be null and void. So far as a king of the period could go, the primate was deposed. But the quarrel was now transferred from William and the primate to William and the pontiff. Anselm sailed from Dover to Whitsand, and from thence he proceeded by the way of Lyons to Rome; being fortunate enough to escape the ambuscades laid for him by the way by the anti-pope Clement. He was received at Rome with a hearty welcome by Urban, by whom he was called the pope of another world, and who called upon all the English at Rome to kiss his toe. Urban warmly espoused Anselm's quarrel with the Red King. He wrote to William, requiring the restitution of Anselm's property. The life of the bearer of that letter was placed in imminent jeopardy. Rufus swore by St. Luke's countenance that if he did not instantly quit the kingdom he would tear out his eyes. Meanwhile, a council had been held at Rome to decide upon the great question of investiture: namely, whether ecclesiastical persons, on being inducted into bishoprics and abbeys, should be permitted to receive the crozier from the hands of a king: in other and plainer terms, whether the clergy should be under the dominion of a king or the pope. It was a knotty question, but easily settled at Rome. At this council it was considered to be horrible for hands that created the creator himself—a power not even granted to angels—and that offered him to the Father as a sacrifice for the world's redemption to be placed in fealty between the hands of a prince who might be stained with every possible excess; and in conformity with this blasphemous idea, the council denounced excommunication against all laymen who should presume to grant the investiture of any ecclesiastical benefice, and all priests who should accept such an investiture. It was also decreed that Rufus deserved excommunication for his treatment of Anselm, but the sentence was not pronounced. Soon after Urban received a letter from the Red King expressing astonishment that he should intercede for Anselm's restoration: adding that he had plainly warned him that if he left the kingdom he would confiscate his revenues, and that by carrying out his threat he had only done that which he was justified in doing. Like his father the Conqueror, therefore, Rufus was not to be intimidated by the pope, and as long as he lived, Anselm lived in exile at Lyons.

SECTION II.

Henry Beauclerk having supplanted his elder brother Robert in the throne of England, like other monarchs of the period whose titles were defective, eagerly sought the support of the pope and court of Rome in order to keep possession of the prize which he had obtained. On his accession, therefore, Anselm was permitted to return to England. The church fancied that Henry would become an obedient son; for he promised neither to farm nor sell the ecclesiastical preferments as Rufus had done, and to restore to the church all its former immunities. He even threw the obnoxious Flambard, who had been the agent of the late oppressions, into prison. Henry had been crowned before the primate's arrival, but his apology was so handsome that no notice was taken of the irregularity. There was for a time perfect concord between them. That concord, however, was not enduring. The church had scarcely acknowledged his title to his throne and sanctioned his marriage with the nun Margaret, when he renewed the quarrel respecting investiture, by demanding, that Anselm should do homage for his archbishopric. To this demand the prelate returned a decided negative: rather than comply he said he would hold no communion with him, and leave the kingdom. The subject was again referred to Rome, and Pascal II., now pontiff, true to the policy of his predecessors, decided in favour of the church. Henry repudiated this decision: Anselm was commanded either to do homage or leave the kingdom. He would do neither, he replied: he would remain in his province, and defy any one to do him an injury. A deputation was now sent to Rome to declare, in the name of the king and the nobles, that unless the right of investiture was conceded, they would banish Anselm, and dissolve their connexion with the papal see. Pascal was perplexed; he had no desire to lose his hold on England, and he was still more unwilling to relinquish his pretensions to supreme authority over the church. To escape from his dilemma, Pascal had recourse to cunning at the expense of his veracity. Three bishops had conveyed the message of Henry and his nobles, and about the same time two monks had arrived at Rome to plead the cause of Anselm. To the bishops, Pascal verbally conceded the right of in-

vestiture as claimed by the king; excusing himself from committing his permission to writing lest other sovereigns should make the same demand and despise his authority. But he was not so cautious in his dealings with the monks; for to them he gave letters to Anselm, exhorting him to resist all investitures to the last extremity. Both parties returned to England, and at a great council held in London, A.D. 1102, the bishops told their tale; and the monks produced their letters. The council was divided in opinion. The king and the barons believed the bishops; and Anselm and his friends relied on the contents of the letters. Both parties, however, suspected the craft of Pascal, and it was decided that other ambassadors should be sent to Rome to ascertain the truth of the matter: Anselm promising in the interim to hold communion with those prelates who had received investiture from the king "by ring and crozier."

While this question was in abeyance, by Henry's permission Anselm held a great council of the clergy at Westminster, at which several abbots were deposed for simony and many canons were decreed. Among these canons the following were the most remarkable: by one, the married clergy were commanded to put away their wives, whom Lanfranc had permitted them to retain; by another, it was decreed that the sons of priests should not be heirs to their fathers' churches; and by a third, all marriages were prohibited within the seventh degree of kindred; a law that brought great power and wealth to the church at the expense of great inconvenience and perplexity to the state. It would seem that there were still relics of Druidical superstition existing at this time in England, for by the twenty-sixth canon of this council the worship of fountains was strictly prohibited.

In the spring of A.D. 1103, Henry had an interview with the primate, at which he endeavoured, both by threats and promises, to induce him to do homage for his see. But it was in vain. His messengers, he replied, had returned from Rome with letters which he had not opened, and whatever were their contents he would abide by them. It is related that he did not open these letters till he was on his way to Rome, whither, finding that Anselm was not to be moved by either threats or promises, Henry had entreated him to repair to endeavour to procure what others had not been able to obtain, that he might be allowed to enjoy the prerogatives of his predecessors. Anselm expressed his readiness to undertake such a mission, but it may be doubted whether he was sincere in its object. If he was when he opened his letters, which he is said to have done at Beck, in Normandy, he could have no hopes of success in his embassy. There was no mistaking the language of these letters. Pascal expressed his warm approval of Anselm's conduct: denied the truth of the report made by the three English prelates, and stated that he had excommunicated them as liars; and declared that he was determined to see the canons against lay investitures fully executed, on the ground that if emperors and kings were allowed to give bishops the crozier, the sign of their pastoral offices, and the ring, the sign of their faith, both the church and Christianity would be uprooted. Some years of negotiation followed between Henry and the pope on this, to them, vital question, during which Anselm remained abroad, longing to return to his see, but unwilling to do so except on his own terms. In the end, however, a compromise was effected. The pope consented that if Henry would abstain from persisting to claim the rights of investiture, the bishops and abbots should do him homage, in the same manner with the lay tenants in chief of the crown for the temporalities of the see. Henry consented to this, and Anselm returned and paid such homage to the king; and thus, in the year 1106, ended this remarkable controversy.

Hitherto, the canons against the marriage of the clergy had been ill-observed. Nature had proved stronger than the laws of the church. But on this subject, as on all others, Anselm was inflexible. In the year 1108, another council was held in London to enforce the celibacy of the clergy. Ten canons were passed at this council more rigid than any that had yet been promulgated. Priests of every degree were commanded instantly to put away their wives; not to suffer them to live on any lands belonging to the church, and never to see them or speak with them, except in urgent cases, and then only in the presence of witnesses. As a punishment for their crime in marrying, they were not to say mass for forty days, and they were to perform such other penances as their diocesans should prescribe. Those who refused to put away their partners whom they had promised before God to love and cherish in sickness and health, in life and to the day of their death, were to be deposed and excommunicated, and all their goods were to be confiscated; while their wives were to be treated as adulteresses, and to become the slaves of the bishop of the diocese. Such canons as these prove that it was difficult by any species of ecclesiastical tyranny to sever the natural and virtuous affection that existed among the married clergy and their wives at this period.

Anselm died A.D. 1109. Like his predecessor, Lanfranc, he was a man of learning. His writings, still extant, prove that he possessed a considerable share both of literary knowledge and metaphysical acuteness. Like Lanfranc, also, he established schools and diffused learning in the country of his adoption; and it is recorded to his honour, that the English loved him as if he had been of Saxon origin. But with all his learning and philanthropy, he was zealous and obstinate in promoting the ambitious views of the church of Rome, and by so doing involved himself, as well as Henry and his country, in many troubles. At the same time, it would appear that he conceived, by defending the rights of his station and order, he was in the path of duty; for it is evident that the contest he so sternly waged, was not for any personal or selfish object. He worked for Rome.

Having suffered so much from the opposition of Anselm, the king was in no haste to fill the see of Canterbury. It was vacant five years, at the end of which time, after a severe contest between the monks of Canterbury and the prelates of that province, Radulphus, bishop of Rochester, was elected primate. As the pope had not been consulted in this election, it was not without considerable demur that he sent the pall to England, and when he did send it, it was

by a letter of reproof to the king and the heir conduct: censuring them bitterly for eglect of the holy see, and threatening excommunication if they were not more he future. From this time there was no it in ecclesiastical history in the reign of clerk. There was, indeed, a dispute about ons of the archbishop of York to make a canonical obedience to the archbishop of but that was never settled. As the nanding priests to put away their wives sobeyed, others of a more stringent nature lgated; and these failing in their object, ncil decreed that they should obey the a given day or be turned out of their d houses, and declared incapable of ever office or benefice in the Church. This ever, was never put into execution. To ectual the council committed its execution ad he found it more expedient to impose a e of the clergy who chose to retain their ax that was universally and cheerfully ral affection defied the tyranny of the me on this point, for during this period ad it is a fact that redounds to the honour thood—was never fully established in the ngland.

seen, in the reign of King Stephen, his tle to the crown gave the ecclesiastical den opportunity of extorting from him an ment of its haughtiest pretensions; pre- ich the Norman kings had hitherto most and, on the whole, successfully resisted. ing this turbulent reign that exemption yal investiture, and the right of carrying l causes by appeal to Rome, were conceded, were not actually conceded, they were like hrone, usurped. Henry Beauclerk, how- buted not a little to this consummation, end of his reign a legate from Rome had a right of road into England, and the which was manifested by the national nst this active emissary of the Pope was ull and void in the reign of King Stephen, ring the legate with the archbishop of himself. This, as it has been observed, er-stroke of policy, for it at once removed of the insurgents, and grafting the un- tensions of the legate on the acknowledged e primate, made him in his latter character stalking-horses for papal encroachments. e high spirit of the clergy would have em to resist him in one capacity, their hat was due to him in his other capacity in check; to abstract the legate from the n was impossible."

gh the Church triumphed in the reign of , Stephen, the contest between the crown tre was renewed in the reign of Henry II. orable struggle between that monarch and Becket, as before fully recorded. This se out of the celebrated constitutions of which were assented to by the barons and tes, but which were sternly opposed by the abishop, an opposition which led to his flight to the Continent and finally his death. These constitutions were the law of the land while Becket lived, and they remained unrepealed for some time after his death, and Henry's reconciliation with the Pope, A.D. 1172; although it is said that he only obtained absolution on solemnly promising to abolish all customs and laws hostile to the clergy, that might have been introduced into his kingdom since he ascended the throne. If Henry did make that promise, on his reconciliation with the pontiff, he certainly did not perform it till the year 1176, when at a great council, held at Northampton, the modification—not the repeal of these celebrated constitutions—was effected. These modifications were twofold; first, they conceded that no priest should be brought to trial before a civil court, except for offences against the forest laws; and second, they restricted the king from holding any vacant bishopric or abbey for more than a year, except it was found to be impossible to fill up the vacancy during that period.

The history of religion during the reign of Henry the Second chiefly consists of this memorable struggle between the crown and the mitre, and of individual quarrels between ecclesiastics; the latter being unworthy of record in the historic page. Brief mention must be made, however, of an incident which occurred in this reign, which may be considered as the earliest dawn of the Reformation. Hitherto there had been no opposition displayed towards the tenets taught by the Romish Church. Its faith, however corrupt, had been implicitly received by the people. But reason and intellect, which the Church had so long bound in chains, now made a faint attempt for freedom of thought in matters of faith. About the year 1160, some thirty Germans arrived in England, and began to disseminate doctrines contrary to those of the Church of Rome. No great success attended their efforts, for it is said that in the course of five years they had only made one convert. But "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," and this one conversion might have been followed by thousands. The Church therefore took the alarm. In all ages of the world the Romish Church has been characterized by a spirit of persecution, and that spirit was at length displayed towards these poor Germans. The astounding fact that one Englishman had been seduced from its faith, was sufficient to bring down its vengeance on these poor, peaceable, and humble Germans. They were arrested, thrown into prison, and brought to trial before King Henry himself. They were asked what was their belief. They were Christians, their leader, Gerard, replied, and venerated the doctrine of the Apostles. Such a reply could not have ensured their condemnation, for all ecclesiastics, from the Pope to the meanest monk, professed the same veneration for Holy Writ. On being close questioned, however, it appears that they held heretical opinions concerning the eucharist, baptism, and marriage; that is, their opinions on these matters differed from those of King Henry and his clergy. They were, therefore, called upon to recant, otherwise they were to be punished. Firm in their faith they refused to recant, and professed to rejoice in the prospect of suffering. What was to be done with these heretics? Heresy was unknown in England; but it must be nipped in the

bud, or woe to the prosperity of the Church of Rome! But what was to be done; for as no canons against heresy had hitherto been required in Catholic England, so none had been published. The judges of these poor Christian Germans were placed on the horns of a dilemma, when it was recollected that some canons had been enacted by the Council of Tours against the Albigenses, of whom these strangers appear to have been a remnant. It was in conformity with these canons that sentence was pronounced. They were to be branded on the forehead with a hot iron; to be publicly whipped and sent out of Oxford, their place of trial; and every one was forbidden by proclama- to shelter or relieve them. Still they were undaunted. Like the saints of old, when smarting under the inflictions of pagan Rome, they went to their place of punishment rejoicing; they sang triumphantly, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you and persecute you." The tale is soon told. It was mid winter when they were sent out of the gates of Oxford with seared brows and bleeding and half-naked bodies, and they wandered about the fields, like the Saxon outlaws of former times, till death relieved them from their sufferings. Ages had elapsed since Alban, "England's first martyr," perished by the fiat of pagan Rome: these poor Germans were the precursors of a long list of martyrs who suffered in England under the rod of papal Rome. But for the present heresy was rooted out, and the Church went on merrily in its domination over the minds and consciences of both king and people.

SECTION III.

The reign of Richard the lion-hearted is not distinguished by any marked event in the history of religion. That was an age when kings, prelates, barons, and people were absorbed in the great subject of the Crusades. Even the clergy, who had gained all that they had contended for at home, despite the canons enacted against their bearing arms, eagerly repaired to Palestine to fight for the possession of the holy places. Richard was in high favour with the court of Rome. His zeal in the holy warfare combined with his prowess caused him to be looked upon as the champion of the Cross; and when he was imprisoned in the castle of Tiernsteign in Germany, no one was more zealous in effecting his deliverance than the sovereign pontiff; yet, when on one occasion Richard showed symptoms of opposition to the Church of Rome, the power which had been exerted for his release from captivity was not backward in reducing him to obedience. The monks of Canterbury had given great offence to the king and the prelates by their persistence in claiming the right to elect their archbishops. If they did not establish their claim they had obtained great influence in their election; to diminish which a recent archbishop had attempted, but in vain, to establish a society of secular canons in the vicinity of Canterbury. Hubert Fitzwalter, who had been with Richard in the Holy Land, was in the year 1193 raised to the primacy; the monks of Canterbury being induced to elect him by the queen-mother and Richard's ministers, the king having entreated them, in a letter written while in prison in Germany to procure his advancement. But thou the monks of Canterbury had thus favoured Hub he, like his predecessor, desired to diminish th influence. To that end he formed a design establishing a society of secular canons at Lamb He hoped that the distance of Lambeth from Can bury would prevent any opposition, but in this he mistaken. With the approbation of Richard he co menced the erection of a splendid edifice for the r dence of the rival body. The monks, however, took alarm and raised a most violent opposition to his desi Both Richard and Hubert sought to allay the fears any abridgment of their privileges. They were p mised that every canon of Lambeth should, before admission into office, go down to Canterbury and ta a solemn oath at the high altar of the cathedral th he would never claim a vote in the election of archbishop, or consent to the removal of the see Canterbury, or the relics of Thomas à-Becket fro their shrine in that city. He should swear solemn they said, that he would never do anything to t prejudice of the ancient rights of the church Canterbury. But the monks were not to be hoo winked: two of their members were sent to lay the grievances before Pope Innocent III. It was opportunity for a fresh display of papal power, a was eagerly embraced. The monks' messengers turned with a bull from Innocent, directing th primate to demolish the edifice he was erectin within thirty days, under the penalty of being su pended from his office. "It is not fit," wrote th imperious Innocent, "that any man should hold a authority who does not reverence and obey th apostolic see." It was now that Richard placed hi self in opposition to the court of Rome. Offend with the Canterbury monks for sending messengers Rome without his permission, he threatened the with confiscation of their possesions if they insist on the execution of the papal bull; and when found that they were inflexible he carried out h threat. At the same time the primate sent agen to Rome furnished with large sums of money, a bearing letters in his favour from his suffragan in the hope of gaining Innocent over to his side; b the monks, also, again sent their agents to Rome, a they prevailed. Innocent confirmed his former se tence, and threatened the primate with the highe sentence of the Church if he did not instantly d molish the works at Lambeth. He also addressed bull to Richard, threatening him for contumacy abetting the archbishop; and warning him that if persevered he should be quickly convinced that was hard to kick against the pricks. Subsequentl another mandate was addressed to Richard, in whic Innocent declared that he would not endure the lea contempt of himself or of God, whose place he hel on earth; adding that he would punish without dela and without respect of persons, every one who pr sumed to disobey his commands, in order to convin the world that he was determined to act in a roy manner. Both the king and the primate were i timidated at the Pope's menaces: Richard restore the confiscated possessions to the monks, and Hube had the obnoxious building at Lambeth levelled the ground.

If Pope Innocent acted thus imperiously towards Richard, the celebrated champion of the Cross, it is no wonder that he domineered with still greater insolence over the dastard King John. In the reign of that monarch the great contest respecting the appointment to the higher ecclesiastical offices between the Pope and the clergy on the one side, and the Crown on the other, was renewed. How that contest was carried on, and how it ended, has already been recorded in the history of that reign; and it will be sufficient here simply to remind the reader that John was reduced by the issue to a state of complete vassalage to the Church of Rome.

During the whole of this period, the constitution of the English Church remained nearly the same as it was at the time of the contest. The chief alteration was that made in the creation of two new sees, those of Ely and Carlisle, making in the whole seventeen, including the two bishoprics. It may be mentioned, however, that in the twelfth century two new orders of monks were introduced into England; namely, the Cistercians and Carthusians. These orders were chiefly distinguished from the only order previously existing—the Benedictines, established by the famous Dunstan—by subjection to a severe discipline, and especially the Carthusians, who were not allowed to eat flesh at any time, and who, during one day in the week, were only permitted to eat bread and salt, and drink water. This order, however, never greatly flourished, for as a rule the monks in England were fond of the flesh-pot and the juice of the grape. On the contrary, the Cistercians, who were chiefly distinguished by having their houses erected in solitary places, appear to have become numerous both in England and Scotland.

The marked feature of devotion in this period was that of pilgrimages to spots of supposed sanctity. Such a species of devotion had, as former pages disclose, been displayed in the Anglo-Saxon age, but it was now more fully developed. There were pilgrimages to Jerusalem, Mount Sinai, and other places in the Holy Land; to Loretto; to Rome: and after the canonization of Becket, to his shrine at Canterbury. It was to Palestine that the greater number of pilgrims resorted—the tomb of the Redeemer being naturally the principal object of attraction. Regardless of the dangers they encountered from the swords of the Abassides of Arabia, the Fatimite Caliphs of Egypt, and of the wild Turcomans who, in succession, possessed the Holy Land; monarchs, nobles, and peasants, alike flocked thither by hundreds and thousands as pilgrims to worship at its hallowed shrines. The roads were thronged with palmers—for such was the name given to pilgrims from the practice of bearing palms in their hands—who conceived that to be able to kiss the tomb of the Redeemer was the one great blessing of life.

It was from the practice of pilgrimages that the Crusades had their origin: all Christendom coming to rescue the Holy places from the hands of the infidel. Four of these expeditions belong to the Anglo-Norman period; the first, A.D. 1097: the second, A.D. 1147: the third, A.D. 1189: and the fourth, 1204. Never was a war more popular than this war of the Cross against the Crescent. The prospect of fighting against the infidel Turk, of returning with wealth and glory, or of dying in the assured hope of everlasting bliss, made the Crusade as welcome to kings, princes, and barons as the gayest tournament. The Crusades were professedly religious enterprises; but at the time they were waged, they were the plague of Europe and the scourge of Asia and Egypt. Indirectly they were of ultimate benefit; but their war in blood and treasures far outweighed the advantages derived from them at the time they were waged. It is probable that they saved Europe from a more formidable Mohammedan aggression within its bounds than that which afterwards occurred; and it is certain that they introduced many of the products of the East to the knowledge of the West, and contributed to relax the bonds of the feudal system in Europe by the departure of tyrannical nobles and knights to distant lands, from whence numbers never returned. Their effect upon the social condition of the people, indeed, was far greater than upon the religion of the age, for the interests of which they were ostensibly promoted by the Romish Church.

Among the remarkable phenomena that sprung out of the Crusades was the establishment of two religious orders of knighthood, the Knights Templars and Knights Hospitallers, the origin of which may be briefly related.

In the Crusade, commenced A.D. 1097, Jerusalem was captured, and at its siege and capture there were nine knights who had greatly distinguished themselves. Burning with zeal, these knights formed a holy brotherhood in arms for the protection of pilgrims—whose numbers were increased a hundred fold—through the passes and defiles to the city. Protection was necessary, for though the Crusaders had obtained possession of the city, bands of fugitive Mussulmans lurked around these passes and defiles for the purpose of pillaging Christian travellers, while Bedouin horsemen made rapid incursions from beyond the Jordan, and scoured the plains. Whether the pilgrim approached Jerusalem by sea or by land, he was alike exposed to plunder and to death. Such good service did these nine knights render to defenceless pilgrims, that Baldwin II., king of Jerusalem, granted them a place of habitation within the sacred enclosure of the temple on Mount Moriah—whence they derived the name of Knights Templars. The early condition and pretensions of these first valiant members of Knights Templars were of the humblest character. They were proud to bear the character of the pauper soldiers of Jerusalem; but when, ten years after, Pope Honorious sanctioned their order and blessed their arms, men of noble birth throughout Christendom joined their ranks; and while the pontiffs of Rome and the kings of Europe granted them immunities and privileges, persons of all ranks showered upon them rich legacies and donations of lands and treasures. In a brief period the Knights Templars acquired ample possessions in every part of Europe—the chief house of the order in England being the Temple in London. The order was introduced into England in the reign of the first Henry, who, with all his immediate successors, granted them considerable privileges and bestowed considerable wealth upon them. King Stephen gave them manors, lands, houses, windmills, and advowsons of churches; and even the coward

John, for the renown they had gained in the battle-fields of Palestine, freed them from all amerciaments in the Courts of Exchequer, and granted them the privilege of not being compelled to plead except before the king himself or his chief justice.

The order of Knights Hospitallers had a different origin from that of the Templars. Their order arose from acts of mercy and kindness: for it was their duty, during the period of the Crusades, to administer to the necessities of pilgrims and of the sick and wounded Crusaders; but like the Templars, the Hospitallers grew rich. Soon after their institution, they too acquired establishments and extensive possessions, their principal seat in England being at St. John's Hospital, Clerkenwell. The two orders finally became rivals, but, as will be seen in the succeeding period, both were doomed to be overthrown by the Crown.

It is remarkable that while the papacy made great encroachments both on the prerogatives of the Crown and privileges of the Church in England, during this period, no such encroachments were made on those of the Crown and Church of Scotland. It is true that on two occasions, during the reign of William the Lion, there was direct papal interference, but it was at his express desire. In the treaty of peace, A.D. 1174, by which that king obtained his release from captivity, it was stipulated "that the Church of Scotland should yield that subjection to the Church of England that it had been accustomed to yield in the reigns of former kings." This certainly left the controversy which had existed between the two churches upon its former footing, but it is related that William wrote a letter to the Pope acknowledging that the Church of Scotland had been formerly subject to the archbishops of York, and that the Church of York had been deprived by force of its authority; and that, therefore, he prayed his holiness to restore that Church to the possession of its rights. A bull was accordingly issued subjecting the Church of Scotland to the primacy of the archbishops of York; but the controversy now grew hotter than before. If William wrote that letter, it was evidently under pressure: and when that pressure was fully removed in order to put an end to the pretensions of the prelates of York to the primacy of Scotland, he wrote again to Rome, and this time he obtained a bull from Pope Celestine III., A.D. 1192, which declared that the Church of Scotland was subject only to the see of Rome; that none but the Pope or his legate had a right to lay that kingdom under an interdict; that none but a Scotch prela one sent direct from Rome, should be capable of legantine authority in Scotland; and that all co versies that could not be determined within kingdom should be referred for decision to the p court. A few years after, A.D. 1201, Pope Inno did send a legate to Scotland, who, at a council at Perth, determined several ecclesiastical controve then existing, particularly one between the bis of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and the abbot monks of Kelso. At a later date, A.D. 1211,

DOMINICAN MONK. CISTERCIAN MONK.

bishops of those sees received a legantine commis from Innocent, by virtue of which, with the con of the king, they held a national council at Perth, design of which was to promote a crusade for recovery of Palestine. By the exhortations of t prelates and the rest of the clergy, many of common people, but very few of the Scottish nobil took the cross; for they had a wholesome drea sharing the fate of about five hundred of their o who had accompanied King Richard under the cond of Earl David, brother to William the Lion, and w saving and excepting David himself, had left t bones to bleach on the Syrian shore.

CHAPTER IV.

The History of Literature, Science, and Art, from A.D. 1066 to A.D. 1216.

SECTION I.

Literature.—ALTHOUGH there is reason to believe that, prior to the Norman Conquest, learning in England had begun to recover from the profound darkness which had covered the face of Europe and almost the whole of the then known world for several a after the fall of the Western Empire, yet there equal reason to believe that it was still at a very l ebb. The great body of the laity were wholly illi

nate, and the clergy can only be said to have possessed the first rudiments of knowledge whether of a religious or secular character. It was their general ignorance which the Conqueror made his excuse for depriving them of their benefices and supplying their place with foreigners. At that time a remarkable revival of letters had taken place on the Continent, and as England by the Conquest was, as it were, made a part of the Continent, it naturally partook of its refinements. Most of the scientific knowledge of the period was derived from the Greeks of the Eastern Empire, or the Arabs of Spain and Africa, Arabic Spain being the fountain head of learning in Europe; but this learning was not brought into England before the Conquest, and therefore to that great revolution it owed the blessing. Warrior as he was, the Conqueror himself loved and patronized letters. Gibbon says—"He filled the bishoprics and abbacies of England with the most learned of his countrymen who had been educated at the University of Paris, at that time the most flourishing school in Europe. He placed Lanfranc, abbot of the monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, in the see of Canterbury—an eminent master of logic, the subtleties of which he employed with great dexterity in a famous controversy concerning the real presence. Anselm, an acute metaphysician and theologian, his immediate successor in the same see, was called from the government of the abbey of Bec, in Normandy. Herman, a Norman bishop of Salisbury, founded a noble library in the ancient cathedral of that see. Many of the Norman prelates preferred in England, were polite scholars. Godfrey, prior of St. Swithin's, at Winchester, a native of Cambray, was an elegant Latin epigrammatist, and wrote with the smartness and ease of Martial, a circumstance which shows that the literature of the monks was of a more liberal cast than that commonly annexed to their character and profession. The king himself gave no small countenance to the clergy, in sending his son Henry Beauclerk to the abbey of Abingdon, where he was initiated into the sciences under the care of the abbot Grymbold, and Farice, a physician of Oxford. Nor was William wanting in giving ample revenues to learning. He founded the magnificent abbeys of Battle and Selby, with other smaller convents. His nobles and their successors co-operated with this liberal spirit in erecting many monasteries. Herbert de Lovinga, a monk of Normandy, bishop of Thetford, in Norfolk, instituted and endowed with large possessions a Benedictine abbey at Norwich, consisting of sixty monks. To mention no more instances, such great institutions of persons dedicated to religious and literary leisure, while they diffused an air of civility, and softened the manners of the people in their respective circles, must have afforded powerful incentives to studious pursuits, and have added no small degree of stability to the interests of learning." In the midst of all their wars of ambition, the immediate successors of the Conqueror exhibited a similar regard for the extension of knowledge. His son Henry became the most learned prince and the greatest promoter of learning of the age in which he flourished—whence he derived the surname of Beauclerk, or "the fine scholar." Henry married his only daughter to Geoffrey Plantagenet, earl of Anjou, who was greatly celebrated for his learning, and their eldest son, Henry II., received a learned education under his uncle, Robert, earl of Gloucester, who was more illustrious for his knowledge and virtue than his royal birth. Throughout life the second Henry is said to have devoted his leisure hours to reading and the discussion of literary questions with the learned men of the age; and his three sons—Henry, Geoffrey, and Richard—appear to have inherited his taste for literature, although they never attained that distinction which he possessed as a scholar.

Under the patronage of these princes, learning could scarcely fail to revive, and to some extent flourish. But there were other causes which contributed to this revival. During this period the art of making paper—of cotton first, and afterwards of linen rags—was invented, which rendered the acquisition of books less difficult and expensive than it had formerly been. The Crusaders, also, may have been a means of aiding the progress of learning, for as the sciences and arts were in a flourishing condition in the Greek empire and the East, it is reasonable to suppose that some of the Crusaders acquired knowledge which they could not have obtained in their own country, and that on their return home they imparted that knowledge to their own countrymen.

In this age, also, schools and other seminaries of learning were greatly multiplied, and especially in the twelfth century, which is particularly distinguished by the institution of universities in Europe; that name being given to some of the schools which had long existed, and which had acquired celebrity as seats of learning. Such was the case with the oldest universities of Europe, as those of Bologne and Paris, and of Cambridge and Oxford; for it was during this period that these latter schools were first enrolled in the list of universities. But notwithstanding the reputation of Oxford and Cambridge as seats of learning, during the whole of the twelfth century, English students continued to resort to the more distinguished foreign schools, if not to be wholly educated, at least to complete their education, the University of Paris, then called "the city of letters," being the most popular. The English students at Paris were so numerous and so distinguished for genius and learning, as well as by their generous mode of living, that they attracted the notice of all strangers visiting that city. This is proved by some Latin verses written, A.D. 1170, by Nigel Wircker, then studying at Paris, which has been thus translated:—

"The stranger dress'd, the city first surveys.
A church he enters, then to God he prays;
Next to the schools he hastens, each he views,
With care examines, anxious which to choose:
The English most attracts his searching eyes,
Their manners, words, and looks, pronounce them wise.
Theirs is the open hand, the bounteous mind:
Theirs solid sense with sparkling wit combined.
Their graver studies jovial banquets crown,
Their rankling cares in flowing bowls they drown."

But though learning was cultivated with greater assiduity in this than in the former period, it was chiefly by those who were destined for the Church. It is said of the celebrated Abelard, one of the teachers of the University of Paris, that he had as pupils twenty

persons who afterwards became cardinals, and more than fifty who became bishops and archbishops. The laity generally, and even the nobility, still continued illiterate, or at most only received the mere rudiments of education. Numerous as were the schools in England connected with the cathedrals and monasteries, they appear to have been intended exclusively for the instruction of those who proposed to make the Church their profession; while those established in cities and towns, as at St. Alban, and London, and places too numerous to mention, were chiefly for students intended for the learned professions, and may, therefore, be considered to have been academies of science. It was, indeed, the common belief of the age, that learning properly belonged only to the clergy, and that it was a possession in which the laity were unworthy of participating—a belief that existed for ages, and has, in truth, only been fully discarded in recent times as an irrational dogma.

The literature and science of this period was divided into two branches, the first, or more elementary, comprehended grammar, rhetoric, and logic. This was called the Trivium. The second comprehended music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. This was called the Quadrivium. The study of grammar, or the art of speaking correctly, and of rhetoric, or the art of speaking eloquently, received considerable attention by the scholars of the age, and appear to have been studied with considerable success. But more general attention seems to have been given to the subtleties of Aristotelian logic. Much time and labour was bestowed on that study, and to very little purpose, for the students of logic were apt to run into the two extremes; either speculating on things too high and difficult, or on things too low and contemptible for human investigation. The far greater part of the questions investigated by the logicians of the age, says John of Salisbury, "were of no use in the church or the state, in the cloister or the court, in peace or war, at home or abroad, or anywhere but in the schools." Its character may be illustrated by a notice of the theology of the age, which came to be ranked as a science, and which, like all the sciences, was affected by an extravagant fondness for Aristotelian logic. It was this that produced that species of theology which was long admired, and which was known by the name of "School divinity," and its teachers by the title of "the Schoolmen." When these Schoolmen wrote commentaries on Holy Writ, it was not with a view of explaining the meaning of words or of illustrating the truths contained in Scripture, but to extract certain mystical or allegorical senses out of them, and to found curious questions upon them for subjects of disputation. It was rather for a display of learning that their commentaries were written, than for the purpose of instructing "in the ways of righteousness." Forgetting the grand injunction of the great Apostle Paul, to "avoid all foolish questions, as being unprofitable and vain," their chief delight was to write voluminous systems of divinity, which consisted of questions on all subjects, some of which were impious, others trifling and curious, and others obscene. Those questions were discussed with great logical acuteness, but after all they remained mere questions. For instance, who could give an answer to the following, which, with others of a similar character, was canvassed with the greatest eagerness, and disputed upon with the greatest subtlety? "Was Christ the same between his death and resurrection that he was before his death and after his resurrection?" "Doth the glorified body of Christ stand or sit in heaven?" "Were the clothes in which Christ appeared to his disciples after his resurrection, real or only apparent?" The discussion of such questions as these was about profitable an employment as a man engaged in

> "Dropping buckets into empty wells
> And growing old in drawing nothing up."

All the works of these Schoolmen—which have long consigned a prey to worms and dust—were written in the Latin language. The study of Latin formed a prominent feature in the educational establishments of the period. It was in Latin that the teachers delivered their prelections on all the sciences, and that all logical disputations were carried on; and the churchmen of the period appear to have been, generally, as familiar with it as their native tongue. The classical studies of the period did not extend beyond the Roman authors, and some of the most eminent of these were as yet unstudied and unknown. Of Greek and Hebrew very little was known, though the latter, as well as Arabic, were taught in the Jewish schools that were established in many of the principal towns, which appear to have been attended by youths, both Jew and Christian. Very little attention was paid to mathematical science; but in the thirteenth century the study of medicine and law became general. In the middle of the twelfth century, canon law attained the rank of a science, but like all the other sciences it was marked with the subtleties of the Aristotelian logic; so much so that John of Salisbury says, "the laws became traps and snares in which honest men, unacquainted with logical quirks and subtleties, were caught." About the same time the Roman or civil law was revived in England; and though common law was not yet taught in schools as a science, it was studied with great diligence as a profession, both by the clergy and laity, the number of clerical professional lawyers preponderating. It was the clergy, also, who chiefly taught and practised physic; a science of which, according to John of Salisbury, they knew but little. Writing of the practical physicians of the age, he says:—"They return from college full of flimsy theories to practise what they have learned. Galen and Hippocrates are continually in their mouths. They speak aphorisms on every subject, and make their hearers stare at their long, unknown, and high-sounding words. The good people believe they can do anything, because they pretend to all things. They have only two maxims, which they never violate: never mind the poor—never refuse money from the rich."

Among the most popular studies of this period was the fallacious science of judicial astrology. Astrologers were honoured with the name of mathematicians, and were believed to possess the secret of reading the fates of kingdoms, the events of war, and the destinies of individuals. There was scarcely a prince or great baron in Europe who did not keep one or more

n his household to cast the horoscopes of
The most famous of these astrologers
kind of almanack annually, as "Old
Zadkiel of the present century. In most
eir predictions were expressed in such
vague language that they might be ex-
ıean anything; and by becoming a little
d positive in their predictions, the as-
entually incurred disgrace, and brought
to contempt. In the year 1186, all the
gers in Europe agreed in declaring that,
raordinary conjunction of the planets in
ra, which had never happened before and
occur again, there would arise, on the
ember, at three o'clock in the morning,
that would sweep away towns and cities;
storm would be followed by pestilence,
agues, such as the human race had never

This prediction spread terror and
all Europe, although the Spanish
strologers tried to modify the alarm by a
iction, stating that there would only be a
ks, and a partial failure in the vintage

As the day approached, Baldwin, arch-
nterbury, commanded a solemn fast of
o be observed in all his province. But
confusion of the astrologers, the dreaded
ember was a calm, serene, autumnal day,
'as no storm," says Gervase of Canterbury,
which Archbishop Baldwin raised in
luring this year by his turbulence."
as been made of Lanfranc and Anselm as
most learned men of the age. Their
s productive of numerous commentaries
which were long held in high esteem by
the latter especially being considered one
of scholastic divinity. These celebrated
eigners, but there were two Englishmen
d who equally distinguished themselves
raing and by their theological writings,
rt White, who read lectures on the Scrip-
rd in the reign of Henry Beauclerk, and
ntly became a cardinal and chancellor of
; and Nicholas Breakspear, who, from a
rose to the high station of the pontiff of
the name of Adrian IV, the only English-
r sat in St. Peter's chair. But there was
of writers in this period whose names
particular mention in the historic page
ho figured as theologians. The most
rary remains which have been handed
terity from the Norman age are the
rks of the English chroniclers. Among
e mentioned the old Saxon chronicle,
down to the close of the reign of King
Life of William the Conqueror, from the
haplain, William of Poictiers; a history
y of Croyland, ascribed to its abbot
n Ecclesiastical History reaching to A.D.
lericus Vitalis; a history embracing the
the Conquest to A.D. 1122, by Eadmar,
nterbury; a General History of England
, from A.D. 499 to A.D. 1126, and a more
ry from the latter date to A.D. 1143, with
story of England in four books, by the
celebrated William of Malmesbury; the Annals of England, by Roger de Hovedon, from A.D. 731, when Bede's Ecclesiastical History closes to A.D. 1202, which is a work of rare value; a General History of England, in eight books, from the earliest times to the death of King Stephen, by Henry of Huntingdon; a History of Henry II. and Richard I., from A.D. 1170 to A.D. 1192, and a Life of Thomas à-Becket, by Benedict, abbot of Peterborough; and the Chronicles of the Kings of England from A.D. 1122 to A.D. 1200, by Gervase, a monk of the monastery of Christ's Church, Canterbury. Besides these there are numerous monastic registers of great value to posterity. Such a body of early contemporary history as that formed by the writings of the chroniclers in the Anglo-Norman period is superior, both as regards its extent and merit, to that of any other nation in Europe. It is true its manifold pages are tarnished by monkish legend and garbled story; but they nevertheless contain much of the fine gold of authentic history.

Although poetry did not flourish during the Anglo-Norman period, it was to some extent cultivated. The vernacular language at that time was in a state of transition, and was therefore ill-suited for the sublime and melodious strains of poetry. Hence it is that most of the best poets of the period wrote their poems either in Latin, or in the Romance or Provençal tongue. Still there were some poems written in the English language, crude and unformed as it was. As many of the poets of the period were clerks and monks, their poetry is of a religious character. Anterior to A.D. 1200, a translation of the Old and New Testament was "done into English verse;" and about the same time a version of the Psalms, and a volume of the Lives of the Saints were written in verse. Religious songs were also composed by minstrels to sing in the courts of kings and the halls of barons on the Sabbath, instead of those on love and war, and other profane subjects. Several hymns, in various kinds of verse, were written by the clerical poets of the age; but neither the sacred nor secular poetry of the period possesses any distinguished merit. The secular poetry was chiefly lyrical, the favourite theme being that of all ages, love; but there were satirists even in these days, when it was dangerous to dip the pen in gall. Lover of literature, as he is said to have been, Henry Beauclerk, as before seen, condemned the Provençal poet, de Barre, to death, because he had "composed many indecent songs against him, and sung them openly to the great entertainment and diversion of his enemies." But most of the satires of the age were directed against professionals, and not the men of the sword. Chaucer was not the first poet who lashed the clergy in verse, for at this date the monks were scourged with no unsparing bitterness for their incontinence, indolence, and drunkenness. Thus one of these satires represents a party of nuns rowing

> Up a river of swete milk
> Whar is plente grete of silk
> When the summer's day is hote;

and as they row along at some distance from the nunnery, some monks from a neighbouring abbey plunge into the river, and, having joined them, bear them off to the abbey in triumph: each monk selecting his lady love. The satirist adds:

The munke that wal be stalun gode
And can set a riyt his hode,
He schal hab withoute danger
XII wives each yer.
Al throy riyt and noyt throy grace
For to do himsilf solace.

Other poetry of this period was panegyric, elegiac, pastoral, and descriptive; but as before stated, poetry was, at this time, written chiefly in the Latin language. Among the most celebrated of these Latin poets was Henry of Huntingdon, John of Salisbury, several of the historians of the age, as Eadmar, William of Malmesbury, and Peter of Blois; Joseph of Exeter, styled the prince of Latin poets; Hanvill, a monk of St. Alban's, Alexander Necham, and Walter Mapes, the jovial and witty archdeacon of Oxford and chaplain to Henry II. Mapes has been styled the Anacreon of the eleventh century; his poems were chiefly of a satirical or festive strain. He lashed Pope Innocent for prohibiting the marriage of the clergy, and though a priest, he sang of love and wine right merrily. But the most popular poets of the period were the Provençals, called Troubadours or "Finders," from the fertility of their invention, and who were, in reality, the fathers of modern poetry.

A component part of the literature of the age—for so it was considered—was music. Great attention was paid to church music by the clergy, some of whom composed pieces for the use of the choirs. Church music was at first composed in a grave, solemn, manly style; but towards the end of the twelfth century, it became soft, effeminate, and artificial. John of Salisbury says that it then "debased the dignity and stained the purity of religious worship; for in the very presence of God, and in the centre of His sanctuary, the singers endeavour to melt the hearts of the admiring multitude with their effeminate notes and quavers, and with a certain wanton luxuriance of voice. When you hear the soft and sweet modulations of the choristers, some singing high, others low, some falling in, others replying, you imagine you hear a concert of syrens, and not of men; and admire the wonderful flexibility of their voices, which cannot be equalled by the nightingale, the parrot, or any other creature, if there be any more musical." The composers of church music, at the date of which John of Salisbury writes, appear to have adapted their notes to those of the Troubadours and minstrels who were the chief musicians of the age. The minstrels were the delight of not only princes and barons, but of prelates, who entertained them in their courts and castles, and lavished wealth upon them with a liberal hand. It is related that Matilda, queen of Henry Beauclerc, was so generous to them, from her love of music, that she expended almost all her revenues upon them; and John of Salisbury censures the nobles of his time for "prostituting their favours by bestowing them on minstrels and buffoons." The instruments of the period were the harp, organ, violin with five strings, and various others which appear to have been introduced by the Normans, the harp being the most admired and the most popular for secular, and the organ the only instrument used for church music. The harp was the most common instrument in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland; and there were but few others in the countries. According to Giraldus Cambrensis, t Scotch and Welsh had only three instruments,—t harp, the pibrorn, and the bagpipe, and the Iri the harp with five brass strings, and the timbr Giraldus says that the Scotch music was held to superior to that of the Irish, and that Scotland w resorted to as the fountain head of perfection that art. It may be mentioned that a new music scale—the modern gamut—was invented about A. 1022, by an Italian monk named Guido Aretine, native of Arezzo, an invention which greatly facil tated the acquisition of musical knowledge. It wa indeed, by Aretine's scale that the English compose of this period regulated their musical compositions.

SECTION II.

Architecture.—The Norman period—especially th twelfth century—may be called the age of archi tecture. The Normans were distinguished above a other nations by their taste for magnificent building and their skill was exhibited in England by th erection of splendid ecclesiastical edifices, castles, an fortresses. The reign of Henry I. was particularl remarkable for its numerous and magnificent erection Ordericus, in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' says:—"Th new cathedrals and numerous churches that wer built in all parts, together with the many magnificen cloisters and monasteries, and other apartments monks, that were then erected, afford a sufficien proof of the great felicity of England in the reign Henry I. The religions of every order enjoyin peace and prosperity, displayed the most astonishin ardour in everything that might increase the splendo of divine worship. The fervent zeal of the faithf prompted them to pull down houses and church

CLOISTERS, GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL.

everywhere, and rebuild them in a better manner. By this means, the ancient edifices that had been raised in the days of Edgar, Edward, and other Christian kings, were demolished, and others of greater magnitude and magnificence, and of more elegant workmanship, were erected in their room to the glory of God." The twelfth century was more productive of works of a military class, though the first Henry was a great builder of both church and castle. The Conqueror himself was a castle builder, and so was William Rufus; but the rage for castle building reached its height in the reign of King Stephen, when "every one who was able built a castle, so that the poor people were worn out with the toil of these buildings, and the whole kingdom was covered with them."

The great architects of the age were the clergy. They alone studied architecture, whether ecclesiastical, military, or domestic. Gundulph, bishop of Rochester, is reputed to have been the finest architect of his day; and Peter Colechurch, a London curate, designed the first stone bridge built across the Thames at London. This bridge was commenced A.D. 1176, but it was not completed till A.D. 1209; the renowned Isambert, another ecclesiastic, who had been employed in the construction of bridges at Saintes and Rochelle, being called in to complete the work which Colechurch had commenced.

At the beginning of this period, ecclesiastical architecture did not widely differ in style and manner from that of the Anglo-Saxons. By degrees, however, the Norman style of architecture, which forms an intermediate link between the Roman and the Gothic, became universal. This style began to appear in the reign of Henry Beauclerk, and its principal characteristic feature is the circular arch springing either from a single column varying in every degree from a cylinder of two diameters high to a proportion nearly classical, or from a pier decorated with half-columns or light shafts, the evident origin of the clustered pillar of a later date. The walls were high and massive, rendering buttresses unnecessary, the projections so called being more for ornament than utility. The doors and windows were wide and lofty, having pointed arches, and being sometimes ornamented with clusters of pillars on each side, and great variety of carvings. The larger windows had mullions of stone for ornament. Circular windows were also used, being divided by small shafts similar to the wheel windows of a later date. The arches of the roof were pointed, and the roof was covered with lead. The fabric was ornamented on the top, at each end, with pinnacles, and with a tower over the middle of the cross, on which, towards the close of this period, lofty spires of wood or stone began to be erected. This mode of architecture, with variations, flourished more than three centuries, examples of which may be seen in various parts of the country. An exquisite specimen of Norman architecture may, for instance, be seen in the semi-circular arched doorway of the Temple Church, London: and most of our cathedrals, and even some of our parish churches, are rich in illustrations of the Norman ecclesiastical architecture. Many of the cathedrals of the period were built with Caen stone, the ornaments being frequently formed of Purbeck marble.

NORMAN ARCHES.



ABBEY GATEWAY, BURY ST. EDMUNDS.

The prelates of the age are said to have been munificent builders of cathedrals and churches; but if some spent their wealth in erecting them, there

were others who obtained the ways and means from kings, nobles, and people. It is recorded when Joffred, abbot of Croyland, resolved, in the year 1106, to rebuild the church of his monastery in a magnificent manner, that he obtained a bull from the archbishops of Canterbury and York, dispensing with the third part of all penances for sin to all those who contributed anything towards its erection. This bull was directed not only to the king and people of England, but to the kings and people of all the kingdoms throughout Christendom. All true believers in Christ, rich and poor, were thus invited to contribute of their substance towards the re-erection of the church of Croyland, some of the most eloquent monks of the abbey being sent to proclaim the bull, both at home and abroad. "By these means," says the chronicler, "great heaps of treasure and masses of yellow metal flowed in from all countries upon the venerable abbot Joffred," who thereupon began to collect marble from quarries far and near, together with great quantities of lime, iron, brass, and other materials for the re-erection of his church. Four years were spent in collecting materials, and at length a day was fixed for the ceremony of laying its foundation. But though Joffred had obtained much treasure, the cost of the material appears to have absorbed it, and, therefore, he contrived an effectual means of raising the superstructure. It was on the Feast of the Holy Virgins, Felicitas and Perpetua, that a great host of people of all ranks assembled at Croyland to take part in the ceremony. Joffred commenced it, says the historian, by prayer, and shedding a flood of tears on the foundation; after which, earls, barons, knights with their ladies, sons and daughters, the abbots, clerks, and others, laid a stone, and deposited upon it either a sum of money, or a grant of lands, tithes, or patronages, or a promise of material or labour for the completion of the building. After this, it is added, the abbot entertained the whole company, amounting to five thousand persons, at dinner, which was nothing but right for such a display of munificence. It was by such means as these that in the course of this period almost all the sacred edifices in England were rebuilt, and many hundreds of new cathedrals, monasteries, and churches were erected. Nor was the pious spirit of the age confined to England; for it is related that King David I. of Scotland, besides several cathedrals and churches, erected thirteen abbeys and priories, some of which were structures of great magnificence.

As regards the domestic architecture of this age, generally, there was very little improvement. So late as the end of the twelfth century, the houses of the mechanics and burgesses of London were built of wood, and covered with straw or reeds, as in the days of the Anglo-Saxons. The skill of the clerical architects was chiefly displayed in the erection of cathedrals, churches, or castles. A brief description of an Anglo-Norman castle must suffice. As a rule it was built on an eminence, and near a river. It occupied a considerable space of ground—sometimes several acres—and was surrounded by a deep broad ditch called the *fosse*. Before the great gate, there was an outwork called the *barbacan*, or antemural, that is, a strong high turreted wall designed for the defence of the gate and drawbridge. The v the castle was on the inside of the *fosse*, and were built square towers, two or three stories which served for the dwellings of the pr officers of the castle, and for defensive and purposes. Inside the wall there were lodgin the common servants, or retainers, granaries, houses, and other offices. When the castle w sieged, its defenders stood on the wall, and thence discharged their arrows, darts, and on the enemy. The great gate of the castle, stood in the course of this wall, was fortified tower on each side, and rooms over the p which was closed with ponderous oak doors, plated with iron, and with an iron portcullis o let down from above. Within the outer wall v open court called the *ballium*; and on the in the *ballium* was another *fosse*, wall, gate, and t within which was an inner court where the to keep was erected. This tower was a large fabric, four or five stories high, with walls of im thickness. It was here that the prince or baro his court, and while he was revelling in ple his prisoners of war were confined in deep dungeons below. The whole building, indee sembled a dungeon, for the small windows intr into the thick walls only sufficed to let into its ments a glimmering of the blessed light of h

NORMAN ARCH, BERKELEY CASTLE.

But little skill in architecture was displayed i castles, for they were often nothing more tha masses of building. That of the Tower of Lo a parallelogram of one hundred and sixteen f ninety-six, and sixty-nine feet high; Rochester occupies a square of about seventy feet, and hundred and four feet high; and others, as t Dover, Colchester, Kenilworth, Richmond, and borough, are of the same character. That al constructed nearly on the same plan, though may have been variations, is clear; and dar comfortless as they were, the incessant warfare age rendered such constructions necessary. were erected for protection, and not as the ma of the wealthy are in our days, for elegance an fort. They were a fourfold defence against ass

and, as history discloses, not, at all times, sufficient for protection. They might be taken by four assaults as was the famous castle of Bedford, taken by Henry III., A.D. 1224. In the first, the *barbacan* was taken; in the second, the outer *ballia;* in the third, the wall by the old tower was thrown down by the miners, whereby, through the breach, the inner *ballia* was possessed; and in the fourth, the tower was set on fire by the miners, upon which its defenders surrendered. It would appear that the smaller class of country houses were, at this period, like the barons' castles, built more for protection than for domestic comfort. Thus the manor-house at Boothby Pagnel, which still exists in nearly its original state, is built upon similar principles as the Tower of London. It is in the form of a parallelogram, having a gable at each end, bearing a striking analogy in all its details to the gloomy keeps or towers of the warlike barons.

Sculpture.—An old chronicler records that at this period, every church had a statue of its patron saint, and that cathedrals and conventual churches were crowded with such statues. There is no reason to believe, however, that sculpture was in a flourishing condition. The artists of that age seldom ventured upon the human figure, otherwise than in relief, and when they did, their productions were but an imperfect approach to a figure. Even in monumental sculpture, the effigy was rarely introduced, and when it was, the style was rude. It is true, Matthew Paris says, that some of the statues which the abbot William placed in the abbey church of St. Alban's "were executed in a very masterly manner;" but there are no proofs in existing remains of any great display of skill in statuary. The few examples handed down to posterity are rudely and imperfectly executed: as the figure of Herbert Losing in a niche at Norwich, and those of Henry I. and his queen in the porch of the cathedral at Rochester. The sculptured effigy of this period was generally that of ecclesiastics, who are usually represented as treading on a dragon, emblematic of the evil principle, and piercing it with the pastoral staff or crozier with the right hand, while they held a book in the left; or the right hand is uplifted as if in the act of benediction, and the left hand bears the crozier. These effigies, however, belong to the close of the period, when a bolder style was adopted. As before intimated, some of the sculptures in cathedrals and churches were of a satirical character. Thus in Christ Church, Hampshire, there are a series of satirical and grotesque figures which, no doubt, represent the monkish opinion of the friars. In one, a fox, with a cock for his clerk, is preaching to a set of geese eagerly drinking in his doctrines; and in another, the people are typified by a zany, who while his back is turned upon a dish of porridge is saved the trouble of eating it by a rat. But some of the carvings or sculptures were of a sacred character. One of the most remarkable is the altar-piece of Christ Church, which is supposed to be coeval with Bishop Flambard. This altar-piece represents the genealogy of Christ, by a tree springing from the loins of Jesse. On each side is a niche: one containing a statue of David, and the other, Solomon. Above these are the Virgin with the child Jesus, and Joseph, surrounded by the wise men of the East. Intermingled are projecting heads of an ox and an ass, emblematic of the manger and the flight to Egypt; and higher up are shepherds with their sheep; the former looking up towards a group of angels, over whom, at the apex of the carving, God extends his protecting arms. Exclusive of these figures there are niches which contain nine others, and thirty-two small figures of saints, also in niches, each bearing his particular emblem. The sculpture of this period extended to sepulchral monuments; the earliest of which consisted of stone coffins let into the ground no lower than their depth, the covering stone being generally sculptured by a cross, and sometimes bearing an inscription round the edge. The covering stone stood above the level of the pavement; thus forming a memorial *of* as well as a receptacle *for* the deceased. Later in date the coffin was placed above-ground in the manner of a sarcophagus; the sides of which were sometimes sculptured and adorned with architectural decorations.

SARCOPHAGUS, CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL.

Painting.—Very little is known of the higher departments of painting during this period. Decorative painting, however, and gilding appear to have been very common. The roofs of cathedrals were generally adorned with paintings intermixed with much gilding of gold, and if the historians of the age are to be believed, some of them were "performed with admirable art." Thus, the roof of the cathedral church of Canterbury, erected by Lanfranc, is said to have been adorned with a profusion of elegant paintings; as was that of the church of St. John of Beverley, which was enlarged and beautified by Aldred, archbishop of York, who crowned the Conqueror. But as no traces of these are left, there are no proofs of real artistic merit displayed in them. At the same time, it is certain that painting and gilding were abundantly used in the decoration of ceilings, and especially of cathedrals and churches. It is related that painting was employed in the promotion of the Crusades: "irritating pictures" being sent by the Pope and the clergy to the courts of princes, and exposed to the people in order to inflame their zeal for that "holy cause." Thus, one of these pictures represented Christ tied to a stake and scourged by an Arabian, supposed to be Mohammed; and in that dark age, however rudely it might have been executed, it was well calculated to produce the desired effect. Portrait painting appears to have been common. Thus, full-length portraits of the Conqueror and his queen and two sons were painted in fresco on the walls of a

chapel belonging to the abbey of St. Stephen at Caen, which Montfaucon, who has published prints of them, considered to be originals. Historical painting appears, also, to have been attempted, the walls of palaces and the shields and saddles of the barons being adorned with representations of battles. Peter of Blois bitterly censures the ostentatious vanity of the barons in his day for carrying "shields into the field so richly gilded, that they presented the prospect of booty, rather than of danger, to the enemy;" adding, in biting irony, that "they bring them back in a virgin state." It is only, however, from the illuminated manuscripts that the state of the art, as respects composition and drawing, can be estimated. These manuscripts are remarkable for their profusion of ornament, and graceful, though intricate, illuminating capital letters; and the mater ployed in this department of the art were so that existing missals still dazzle the eye v brightness of their colours and the splendour gilding. If the decorations of the ceil cathedrals displayed the skill of these m paintings, then they were beautiful indeed. was chiefly practised by the clergy; and it these paintings that the portraits of the ki several of the queens, from Edward the Con Henry VII., and of other eminent persons period are derived. They cannot, however sidered authentic portraits, and are chiefly for their illustration of costume.

CHAPTER V.

The History of Industry, Commerce, &c., from A.D. 1066 to A.D. 1216.

Agriculture.—THE Norman Conquest exercised a most favourable influence upon agriculture in England. That event brought thither many thousands of skilled husbandmen from the fertile plains of Normandy, Flanders, and France, who, having obtained estates and farms, employed the same methods of cultivation as those practised in their own countries. Some of the Norman barons were great improvers of their lands. Richard de Rulos, lord of Brunne and Depping, and chamberlain to the Conqueror, is said by Ingulphus to have planted orchards, cultivated commons, converted lakes and quagmires into fertile fields, rich meadows and pastures, and to have rendered a once desert district into "a garden of delights." But the Norman clergy, and especially the monks, made greater improvements in agriculture than the barons. Retaining such of the lands as lay contiguous to their monasteries in their own possession, they cultivated them with great care and skill, sometimes labouring with their own hands. Thomas à-Becket, when primate, reaped corn and made hay with the monks, although, in his case, it is mentioned by the old chronicler Gervase, as an act of humility and condescension. The protection and encouragement of agriculture was an object of attention by the Church. By one of its canons it was decreed that all engaged in the labours of the field—whether presbyters, clerks, monks, converts, pilgrims, or peasants, together with their cattle—should enjoy perfect security; and that all who molested them should be excommunicated. Such a decree was perfectly necessary at some parts of this period, but which, nevertheless, was sometimes, and especially in the reign of King Stephen, wholly disregarded.

The implements of husbandry were similar to those in present use, although their construction was less perfect. The Norman plough, for instance, had two wheels, though only one stilt or handle, and was drawn by one or more oxen, according to the nature of the soil. Then they had carts, harrows, sickles, and flails of a similar character to tl used by the English peasantry. Water-i grinding corn were now common, and th mills turned by horses, which were used i where water-power could not be obtaine however, chiefly used in the Norman armie sieges. Of their operations in husbandry known; but marl was the common manure ordure, as in the time of the Anglo-Saxons designed for wheat lay fallow during the s summer, and were ploughed several times. famous designs of the Bayeux tapestry th figure of a man sowing, with a sheet about containing the seed under his left arm, scatters it with his right; and another f presents a man harrowing with a harrow d one horse.

In all the branches of gardening there v improvement in the Norman age. The Gloucester was celebrated for its great ferti

CORN HAND-MILL.

in corn and fruit-trees. It was planted, says William of Malmesbury, thicker with vineyards than any other province in England; the vines producing grapes of the sweetest taste, in the greatest abundance. Of fruits, besides the grape, there were apples, pears, cherries, and gooseberries. The produce of the garden was peas, beans, leeks, onions, garlic, pot-herbs, and "salted greens," which consisted of some variety of the cabbage tribe. The monks of Wardon in Bedfordshire were famous for the baking pear which gives a name to the warden pie, frequently mentioned in old descriptions of feasts, and which historical novelists have erroneously represented as huge pasties of venison, or other meat suited to the digestive capacities of gigantic wardens of feudal days. The vineyards planted and cultivated were for the purpose of making wine. Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, made wine from the produce of his vineyards; and bishop Swinfield, of Hereford, had a vineyard at Ledbury, the produce of which yielded, at a somewhat later date than that of which we are now treating, seven casks of white wine, and one of verjuice. From all this, it is clear that agriculture and husbandry were much improved during the Anglo-Norman period. In truth, towards its close England was reputed to be the most fertile country in Europe.

At this period fishing was exercised as a necessary art. Great attention was paid in the monastic bodies to piscatory pursuits, not only for subsistence, but for amusement. The treatise on "Fyshing with an Angle," attributed to Dame Juliana Berners, prioress of Sapewell, is still one of the best standard works on that subject. Many of the fish ponds formed at this period are still in existence, and exhibit great skill in their formation. Thus, Netley Abbey must have been well supplied with fish from three ponds in its vicinity, which were connected with each other. The lower pond was within two hundred feet of the abbot's house; this pond, and the middle pond, which is somewhat smaller, covered more than two acres of ground; and they form an oblong, separated by a bank twelve feet broad, and connected by a flood-gate. The upper pond was separated by a similar bank from the middle one, and had also a communication by a flood-gate with the pond below. This covered upwards of an acre of ground, and was of a triangular form, having two small islets at its east end. At the present time the two lower ponds are overgrown with reeds and rushes, but the upper pond is still a fine sheet of water. When the skill of the monks is taken into consideration, as regards the culture of the vine and of corn, it is no matter of surprise that they adopted the most approved method of raising fish by the use of such connected ponds; the first being used in spawning, the second for nursing, the third for convenience nearest the abbey for immediate supply. In some instances there were five ponds of different dimensions, the additional ponds being apparently employed for greater nicety in the assortment in the sizes of the fish as they were removed from one pond to another. It is quite clear from this that the monks of the Norman period knew what was good for the refection of their bodies. The "wasts" and rivers were also productive of food. There were noted fisheries in Kent, Norfolk, and Suffolk; that at Sandwich yielding 40,000 annually to the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury. In the counties of Cheshire and Devonshire there were salmon fisheries; one in the former county paid annually 1000 salmon as rent. In the marsh or fen land there was an abundance of eels; one at Tudworth, in Yorkshire, yielding 20,000 annually.

Handicrafts.—Very few changes took place in the common handicrafts for a century and a half subsequent to the Conquest. The miller and the baker exercised their arts as in the time of the Anglo-Saxons. Water-mills were the property of the lords of manors, and their tenants were not allowed to grind corn at any other mill. For some time these lords, also, monopolized the privilege of baking their tenants' bread at the common furnace; but this restriction was early demolished, and cakes or loaves of bread were allowed to be baked on the hearth. Bakers were under severe penalties for giving short weight: the first offence subjecting them to the loss of their bread, the second to imprisonment, and the third to the pillory or turnbrell. The weight of a loaf varied with the price of corn. Thus, when wheat was sold at two shillings a quarter, the loaf of white bread was to weigh three, and the loaf of brown bread four pounds, the weight being diminished at each successive increase in the price of wheat. As regards builders and artificers, it is evident, from the character of the architecture of this period, that their skill was superior to that of the times of the Anglo-Saxons. The fabrication of armour gave, also, a higher direction in the art of working in metal. The art of refining and working in metals, indeed, appear to have been carried to greater perfection than any of the useful arts. Robert, abbot of St. Albans, sent two candlesticks made of gold and silver to Pope Adrian, A.D. 1158, who declared that he had never seen more beautiful workmanship; and a large cup of gold, made by order of Simon, abbot of St. Albans, by a goldsmith named Baldwin—who made many admirable pieces of plate for the use of churches—is described by Matthew Paris as being "adorned with flowers and foliages of the most delicate workmanship, and set around with precious stones in the most elegant manner." Native artists, many of the most curious of whom belonged to

CUP, GLASTONBURY.

the clerical order, found constant employment in the execution of vessels required in the services of the church, and the costly ornaments with which prelates and abbots adorned both shrines and altars.

Manufactures.—The textile arts were much improved during this period: the art of weaving woollen cloth being, if not introduced, yet brought to far greater perfection by the Flemings, who came over in the army of the Conqueror and at subsequent periods. By the year 1197 this manufacture became of such consequence that laws were made for its proper regulation, both as regards its fabrication and sale. The weavers in all the great towns of England were formed into guilds or corporations, and had various privileges bestowed upon them by royal charters. These privileges, however, were not a free gift from the Crown, but were purchased with gold. The weavers of Oxford paid King Stephen a mark of gold for their guild; and Henry II. received a similar sum from those of Winchester at the establishment of their guild, and two marks annually for enjoying their rights and the privilege of choosing their own alderman. Fullers, also, had their guilds in various towns; and other trades, as that of the saddler, were incorporated: but it was at a subsequent date that these incorporations generally took place.

The art of dyeing was connected with the manufacture of woollen cloth, but it did not arrive to great perfection. Dye-houses were connected with many of the establishments of the nobles, and Jews are said to have followed the trade. Tapestry hangings, with historical figures woven in them, were used in this period, but whether they were made in England or brought from the Netherlands where the art flourished, is not certain. Silks of various kinds are frequently mentioned — being used by kings, queens, prelates, and nobles, but it is not clear that they were manufactured in England. Embroidery, however, was still the occupation of ladies, as in the time of the Anglo-Saxons. Christina, abbess of Margate, worked three mitres and a pair of sandals for Pope Adrian; and the vestments of the higher ranks of the clergy were commonly embroidered, some of them being almost covered with gold and precious stones, and others adorned with figures from nature. It is related that one of the popes of this period having admired the embroidered vestments of some of the English clergy visiting his court, on being told that they were made in England, exclaimed, "O England! thou garden of delights, thou inexhaustible fountain of riches, from thee I can never exact too much;" and immediately sent a bull to some of the English abbots commanding them to procure some embroidered vestments of cloth and silk for the adornment of his own person. As it was regarded a pious work by the ladies to be occupied in working sacerdotal vestments, no doubt his bull was obeyed and his vanity gratified.

Commerce.—At the period of the Conquest, commerce was in a more flourishing condition than it had ever been since the departure of the Romans from our island. William of Poitou, who was chaplain to the Conqueror, distinctly states that merchants from distant countries were wont to import to England articles of foreign manufacture, and testifies to the great wealth of the native or resident merchants both of London and Winchester. Exeter, also, guished for its opulence, for when, A.D. attacked by William, there were a grea foreign merchants and mariners in the l assisted in its defence. The revolution place gave a temporary check to commer feudal form of government which was established, was, for a time, adverse to it but in the end the Conquest contributed to of trade and commerce in England. By when order was secured, a free commu opened with Normandy and afterwards rich provinces on the Continent, which fe dominion of the Anglo-Norman monarch crease of shipping was further favour growth of commerce; and the frequent of William and his successors to Norma them to give constant attention to trade a affairs. It seems probable that their flee engaged in conveying their armies to and Continent, were employed in trading be kingdom and dukedom and the adjac France and Flanders. Then, again, the s the Jews in England was favourable t inasmuch as they brought great wealth which they were ever willing to employ i

As regards internal trade, it appears t carried on, as in the time of the Angl fairs and markets. Despite the canons th made against the practice, these still cont held on the sabbath; and though the famc Eustace, abbot of Flay, in Normandy, wh to England, A.D. 1200, to correct the ab the people of London and other towns to custom, it was soon resumed. As in the fo the chief seat of trade and commerce w but Bristol, Ross, Exeter, York, Norwich Lynn, Lincoln, Boston, and the five to coasts of Kent and Sussex, commonly Cinque Ports, were among the most consi of commerce in England. At that perio which formed the Cinque Ports were Has Hythe, Romney, and Sandwich; to whic sequently added Winchelsea and Rye, a and other towns as members, although original number, they still retained the d Each of the five towns known by the n Cinque Ports was bound, upon forty da furnish and man a certain number of shi proportion to its wealth or population; service various honours and privileges we upon their inhabitants. Other towns coasts and navigable rivers had a shar trade. So extensive did trade eventua that Matthew of Westminster venture though on what data it is difficult to i the ships of Tarshish could not be c number with the ships of England: addi brought to her shores, spices and every pr from the four corners of the world—meani the world as then known. The sea, he England an impregnable wall, and her sides were like the well-fortified gates castle.

The chief exports of this period were al

wool, leather, woollen cloths, corn, lead, and tin. Slaves still continued to be a capital article, both in the internal and foreign trade of England, although at a great council held at Westminster, A.D. 1102, a law was made forbidding "the wicked trade of selling men in markets like brute beasts." The export of horses had been forbidden by the Saxon king, Athelstan, except for presents, but in this period it was allowed without check, and was very profitable. As regards corn, it was chiefly exported after abundant harvests, "when England might," says an old historian, "be called the store-house of Ceres, out of which the world was supplied with corn." It may be doubted, however, whether, from the imperfect state of agriculture, England was ever such a store-house during the Anglo-Norman period, for it is on record that there were frequent famines, some of which were of the most fearful character, and was only relieved by importations of corn from the Continent. From records still extant, it would appear that there were other exports of minor importance, such as cheese, honey, wax, tallow, and salmon.

Among the most valuable imports of this period were wines, spiceries, drugs, gold and precious stones, silks, furs, tapestry, and iron and steel. Wine appears to have been chiefly imported by the French, who, says William Fitzstephen, exposed it for sale in their ships, and in their wine-cellars near the river Thames. In the reign of King John, it appears to have been both cheap and abundant, for Hoveden says that "the land was then filled with wine and drunkards. Spiceries and drugs were the productions of the east. Fitzstephen says:—"The Sabeans import into London their frankincense and other spices; and from the rich country about Babylon, they bring the oil of palms." Of other valuable imports, gold and precious stones were brought from Egypt and Arabia; silks from Spain, Sicily, Majorca, and Ivica; furs from Norway, Russia, and other northern countries; tapestry from Arras in Flanders; and iron and steel from Germany. It is supposed by some that the German merchants of the Steel-yard derived that name from the great quantities of iron and steel which they imported, and which they sold at a place called the *Steel-yard*. Among the minor imports of the period may be mentioned books, pictures, arms, and dye-stuffs, particularly *woad*.

The internal trade of England appears to have been chiefly in the hands of the Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Normans, who were the natives of the country. These were the members of the merchant guilds which were established in several of the towns and cities in the kingdom. Foreign commerce, however, was for the most part in the hands of foreigners. Fitzstephen, who wrote in the reign of Henry II., says that "all nations under heaven had factors residing for the management of their commerce." But the most conspicuous merchants of the period were the Flemings and the Jews, more especially the latter people. Precluded as they were by their religion from engaging in any of the wars waged by nations among whom they settled, they became mere traders. Trade was everywhere carried on by them in the midst of obloquy, danger, and oppression, with the most patient perseverance. They were then, as they are now, the capitalists of the age, for in the midst of all their persecutions, they were continually accumulating wealth. They were plundered by kings, but still they prospered: they were persecuted by the people, but yet they flourished. The odium under which they laboured was universal, yet still, despite the hostility of the popular feeling, and their non-protection under the laws of the kingdom, they created wealth. At different times their wealth enabled them to purchase charters from the Crown, as from the two Henrys and John, for the latter of which—called a confirmation of their charters—they are recorded to have paid four thousand marks. William Rufus is also said to have favoured the Jews, to the great displeasure of the people, for which no doubt he received a money payment. But the favour bestowed upon them by these monarchs was in reality a species of persecution, inasmuch as it was only bestowed in return for the gold they were enabled to give in exchange. That it was actual extortion is unquestionable, for there was a particular exchequer called "The Exchequer of the Jews," which was established for receiving the sums extorted from them in customs, fines, tallages, forfeitures, and "various other ways." King John, no doubt, took great credit to himself for "confirming their charters" for the sum of four thousand marks; but it is on record that in the year 1210, he commanded all Jews to be imprisoned, in order to compel them to pay many thousand more; one Jew at Bristol being, as before related, compelled to pay ten thousand, on pain of losing all the teeth in his head. A species of justification was found for the extortions practised on the Jews in the fact that they were not only traders, but money-lenders, and it is said, and probably with strict truth, at an usurious interest. But if they did not lend money, to whom could a person then resort in his hour of need? According to law, if a Christian was convicted of such a crime as lending money on interest, he was punished by excommunication and the forfeiture of his goods. The Jews, therefore, had all the business of lending money thrown into their hands, and, like many modern Christian money-lenders, they obtained as much interest as the borrower would give; but it often happened that they neither got the principal nor the interest, for although the Christian was willing to borrow, he was often very unwilling to repay; and sometimes not only in England, but in other countries, the debtor was relieved from such liabilities by the grace of the Crown: a king's word freed him from his debt.

During the Anglo-Saxon government commerce had been made the subject of legislation. In this period, also, some laws were promulgated for the regulation of commercial affairs; although for the most part they were not of an enlightened character. Those of the Conqueror were generally founded on the Anglo-Saxon regulations; and it was not till the reign of Henry I. that these laws were abrogated. By the ancient law of England, when a ship was wrecked on the coast, if any of those who escaped from the wreck did not return within a limited time, the ship and cargo became the property of the lord of the manor; but Henry decreed that if one man escaped, the lord of the manor should have no claim

either to the ship or the cargo. This law, however, was disregarded, for the rapacious barons still seized wrecks, as heretofore. But the humane principle was carried out and extended by Henry II., who decreed that if either man or beast should be found alive in any vessel wrecked upon the coasts of England, Poictiers, Gascony, or the isle of Oleron, the property should be preserved for the owners if claimed within three months. By another law decreed by this prince, he emphatically commanded the justices in Eyre, in their progress through the counties, to enjoin upon all the lieges, as they valued their lives and fortunes, neither to buy nor sell any ship for the purpose of its being carried out of England; and that no person should convey or cause to be conveyed away, any mariner out of the kingdom. Henry II. also cultivated the friendship of the emperor Frederic Barbarossa with the view of promoting a free trade between their subjects.

As before related, Richard the Lion-hearted in the early part of his reign, neglected the interests of his kingdom for his famous expedition to the Holy Land. After his return from Palestine, however, he made various mercantile regulations. Thus, as England at that period was threatened with a famine, he ordained that no corn or provisions of any kind should be exported either in English or foreign bottoms. This was only a temporary prohibition; other laws were of a more lasting character. Thus by one law he commanded that all measures of corn, dry goods, and liquors should be uniform throughout England, and that the rim of these measures should be a circle of iron. By other laws he decreed that all cloth should be woven two yards in breadth within the lists, and of equal goodness in all parts; that the coin of the kingdom should be of equal weight and fineness; that no Christian should take interest for money lent; and in order to prevent extortion, that all compacts between Christians and Jews should be made before witnesses, of which three copies were to be made; one to be lodged in a public repository, and one given to each of the contracting parties. The dyeing and sale of cloth was also regulated by a law enacted by Richard. But by a singular coincidence greater attention was paid to trade and commerce in the reign of the tyrant John than in the reign of any other Anglo-Norman monarch. Many charters were granted by him to English merchants in all parts of the country, by which trade and commerce was greatly promoted. It was John who first broadly asserted dominion over the British seas. By an edict published A.D. 1200, he commanded his captains to seize all ships which did not strike their topsails to them, and to confiscate their cargoes and imprison their crews, even though they were the subjects of a power in alliance with England. John also contributed to the improvement of commerce by establishing guilds of merchants with various privileges and immunities; he, however, as before noted, receiving money payments for his favours. He appears, also, to have affected to favour the interests of the trading community, which was now daily rising into greater importance than ever, in order to obtain their support against the power of the barons and the clergy. And yet it was by that power that freedom of commerce was sought to be secured. By one of the cla the great charter, to which he gave a re consent, and which, when granted, he sought aside, it was declared that all foreign mer should be secured against all violence and exactions in times of peace; and that if in t war any merchants belonging to a hostile c should be found in England, they should at th mencement of hostilities be attached without of their persons or property until it should be how English merchants then in the enemy's c were treated; if they were uninjured, then merchants were to be equally safe in England; "there was to be an eye for an eye, and a toot tooth." By other laws it was declared that the of a minor should bear no interest during his mi that London and other cities and towns should their ancient privileges; and that no fine sho imposed upon a merchant to the destruction merchandize.

Coins.—Very little alteration was made b Anglo-Norman kings in the coin used by the Saxons. The only coined money of the period a to have been the silver penny, which, as at the p day, was the twelfth part of a shilling. Thi sometimes denominated *esterling*, or sterling, from German artists called *Esterlings*, who were emp in its coinage." "Living money" is rarely men by the writers of this period; but the denomin of money used by the Anglo-Saxons still contin be in use, except the mancus, oras, and thrismas, appear to have gone out of date about the time Conquest. The coins of the early Norman kings silver penny—are very rare, although they must been numerous, royal mints being established the principal towns in the kingdom. In the l times of King Stephen, the prelates and greater b are said to have had mints of their own, and to coined money in great abundance; but none of baronial coins are known to exist except a few be the names of Stephen's son Eustace, and of his b the bishop of Winchester, which were probably i



SILVER PENNY OF STEPHEN.

by the royal licence. As regards the value of m in this period, compared with our present mone satisfactory statement can be made. Its value a given period is merely the question of the price of ticular commodity—the metal of which it was The relation between the value of gold and differed at different periods. Thus, about the f century, silver was so plentiful, and gold so s that fourteen pounds eight ounces of the former exchanged for a pound of the latter; in the S times, the legal proportion appears to have be one to twelve; and in the Norman, gold had b so abundant, that in the twelfth century, one p of that precious metal was exchanged for nine, a

the thirteenth century for ten pounds of silver. That there was an abundance of gold and silver, notwithstanding the vast sums which were carried to Rome, to fee both Pope and cardinals, and to the Continent by the Anglo-Norman kings, and to Palestine by the Crusaders, is proved by various circumstances. Had not the Jews been rich in gold and silver, they could not have paid the heavy and frequent demands upon them by Government. The coffers of the kings at their deaths, also, were generally full to the overflow; and many subjects, especially the prelates, possessed large quantities of the precious metals. Roger, archbishop of York, who died A.D. 1181, is said to have left in his treasury gold and silver equal in value to more than 200,000*l.* of present money; and more than double that sum was found in the castle of Devizes when taken from Roger, bishop of Salisbury A.D. 1139. There is, indeed, evidence that though large sums were annually carried out of the kingdom, the national stock of silver and gold increased rather than diminished during this age—a proof that coin and bullion were imported into the country in large quantities by the merchants as the balance of their trade with foreign nations; for from the silence of all records on the subject, it may be concluded that no mines, either of gold or silver, were worked in England. It is evident, therefore, that the balance of trade and commerce was in favour of British traders and merchants; that is, the exports were more valuable than the imports, and that to make up the deficiency they received a balance in the precious metals—a proof that commerce was in a flourishing condition.

Shipping.—In the course of this period, the ships of England became more numerous, and were of a larger size and better construction than they had been before the Conquest. By that event, indeed, the ships of Normandy became mixed with those of England; for although many of those employed in the transportation of the Conqueror's sixty thousand warriors, horses, arms, and stores returned to the Continent, a greater number remained in England and augmented its naval power. That England abounded in shipping during the Anglo-Norman age is clear from the frequent voyages of its kings, attended by large armies, chiefly composed of cavalry, between this island and their Norman dominions. But the fleets of that period more resembled transports than the royal navies of modern times. For the most part they consisted of merchant ships; collected when required, and dismissed when their service was performed. The ships of the Norman period, however, were both larger and better built than those of the Anglo-Saxons. The largest called *dromones* had three masts, and as they were too lofty to admit of the use of oars, they sailed very slowly. Some of these must have been of great magnitude, for that taken by Richard from the Saracens on his voyage to Acre, is said to have contained 1500 men, beside stores and war materials. Ships of the second class called *busses*, were also large vessels with three masts, and may be considered to have been smaller *dromones*. Galleys were of different kinds and of different magnitude: the largest being called *barcæ* or barks, and the smallest *barbottæ*. These were navigated with sails and oars, and had decks for the preservation of the goods they conveyed from injury by seawater. That the ships of England were held in high repute is evident, for Henry II. forbade their sale to foreigners; and it is recorded, that when Richard, on his voyage to the Holy Land, touched at Messina, the people of that city declared that so fine a fleet had never been seen in their harbour. It was a gallant fleet for that age; for it consisted of thirteen dromones, one hundred and fifty busses, fifty-three galleys, and a hundred carricks or transports. As in the present day, the English sailors were celebrated for their skill in navigation; a circumstance from which they were forbidden by Henry II. to enter into foreign service. This skill was displayed in Richard's voyage to Palestine—the first in which an English fleet had accomplished so long and various a navigation; for Geoffrey of Vinisauf ascribes the preservation of the lion-hearted king from shipwreck in a storm, to the skill and courage of his sailors. As in the Anglo-Saxon times, English mariners had no compass to guide them in their voyages; but towards the close of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century it was discovered that a needle touched with a loadstone, pointed northwards, and endeavours were made to apply this discovery to navigation. But it remained for a later period to make that discovery applicable to the great end of circumnavigating the globe.

CHAPTER VI.

The History of Manners, Customs, &c., from A.D. 1066 to A.D. 1216.

Chivalry.—After the Conquest, great changes took place in the manners and customs of the people. One of the most remarkable of these changes was that which was brought about by a spirit of chivalry. By the introduction of that spirit, a new phase was assumed in the education of the youthful nobility and gentry. To obtain the honour of knighthood was an object of the highest ambition of both princes and nobles. A youth destined to the profession of arms, and hoping to obtain that honour, was placed under the care of some distinguished knight, in the quality of a page. Even knights of an inferior rank, if renowned for military accomplishments, had sometimes the sons of princes attending upon them in the

quality of pages. The duty of a knight was to instruct his page in military exercises and the laws of courtesy and politeness; and the duty of the page was to pay implicit obedience to his knightly instructor. But the pupil in chivalry did not always remain a page; there were gradations in his road to knighthood. Having spent some time in the quality of a page, he was promoted to the rank of an esquire. That rank obtained, the aspirant for the honour of knighthood was admitted into more familiar intercourse with knights and ladies. He rode, hawked, danced, hunted, and tilted with them, and thus became perfected in all knightly accomplishments. The courts of kings, princes, and barons were, indeed, colleges of chivalry as the universities were of learning and the sciences: in both, the youth proceeded through several degrees to the highest honours.

Fitzstephen describes the youth in these schools of chivalry, before they were knighted, as issuing from the courts of kings, bishops, earls, and barons, on Sundays during Lent, and exhibiting on horseback before the citizens all the active evolutions of a battle. If war broke out, they followed their instructors into actual service; and the barons of the period, when they went to battle, had frequently many of these knights in embryo in their train. In these schools, sincere and lasting friendships were often contracted. Each selected his future companion-in-arms, between whom and himself there was to be, thenceforth, a firm and lasting friendship. They were to stand by each other in peace and war, in prosperity and adversity; to share the same dangers, and to divide equally their acquisitions. Such sworn brothers were Robert de Oily, and Roger de Ivery, who came into England with the Conqueror; and when William granted the two honours of Oxford and St. Waleries to De Oily, the knight immediately transferred the latter to his knightly brother, De Ivery.

The ceremony of conferring the high distinction of knighthood was solemn and imposing. It was generally conferred by the knight in whose court the youth had been educated. It was preceded by various formula: as severe fastings; nights spent in prayer and watching, in a church or chapel; receiving the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist; bathing, and putting on white robes, as emblems of that purity of manners required by the laws of chivalry; confession of sins; and paying serious attention to sermons. These preliminaries performed, the aspirant for knighthood, accompanied by his patron, kindred, friends and companions, with his sword of knighthood dependent from his neck in a scarf, went in a procession to the church, which was highly decorated for the occasion. His sword was there blessed by the priest at the altar, and the oaths of the order of chivalry administered. He swore that he would be loyal and obedient to his prince; that he would defend the Church and the clergy; and that he would be the champion of virtuous ladies, orphans, and widows. After this, he was arrayed in armour, his sword girded on his side, and his spurs buckled on, either by warriors or high-born ladies. Then the honour of knighthood was conferred by the patron from whom he was to receive it, by advancing and giving him the accolade, three strokes with the flat of the sword upon the shoulder—his patron as he gave those strokes:—"In the nam St. Michael, and St. George, I make thee Be brave, hardy, and loyal!" Then leapin saddle of his war-horse, the newly-creat pranced up and down the church, and iss galloped to and fro, brandishing his display his chivalric accomplishments: knight, and as such, could aspire to the high and distinctions in the kingdom. It was later age that the principles of chivalry developed, but the above description em main features in the Anglo-Norman period.

Heraldry.—The science of heraldry owes to chivalry. It is probable that the Nor the Anglo-Saxon warriors, were anciently a to adorn their shields and banners with the animals and other devices. In doing this, every one followed his own fancy, just as t Britons did in having devices formed u naked bodies. In neither was there any re to the figures or devices that had been born ancestors. It was a display of individual c of family distinction. As romantic valour, was displayed to the uttermost in the Crusa peculiar sanctity was supposed to belong to like devices of the Christian knights, their assumed the hallowed escutcheon which the the battle-fields of Palestine. Jousts and tou also, contributed to render arms hereditar son, proud of the honours gained by his sir fields of fame, had his shield adorned with devices when he engaged in the same sc But it was from the Crusades chiefly that upon the shield became a family and herec tinction, and heraldry assumed the form of science; posterity not only adopting the dev as the bezant, crescent, and other Asiatic which the Crusaders bore upon their shield conflicts with the Saracens, but mottoes ta the war-cries with which they summoi followers to battle. It was only, however degrees that the custom became univer finally, the shield became, by the refine heraldry, so crowded with figures that it v necessary to adopt a more simple method guishing the rank and honours of a nobl that method being the adoption of a simple

When the Normans adopted family es they do not appear to have assumed famil The surnames by which the Norman sovere distinguished were the "Bastard," the " "Fine Scholar," the "Lion-hearted," and th less;" just as the Anglo-Saxons were dist from one another by such descriptive epith "Black," the "White," the "Long," and the These additions were not regarded as fami for if a son did not possess the properties de the epithet by which a father was distingu had no right to assume it. It would, indeed cases have been absurd for a son to have ad epithet by which his father had been know properties he possessed might have been reverse of characteristic. Most of the En only one name, but the Normans very early

second names—as De, Le, Fitz—which were commonly derived from the castles in which they resided, or the estates which they possessed. It is from this custom that so many of the nobility of England at the present day bear names which may be identified with the towns, castles, and estates which their ancestors possessed on the Continent.

Norman Magnificence.—Personal distinction was marked in this age, not only by heraldic insignia and surnames, but by numerous and splendid retinues. Kings, prelates, and barons alike, thus displayed their magnificence. Longchamp, bishop of Ely, is said to have had a thousand or more horsemen in his retinue; and Peter of Blois, in describing one of the royal processions of Henry II., says that it was formed, not only of knights and nobles, cavalry and foot soldiers, but of baggage-waggons, tents, packhorses, players, prostitutes, gamesters, cooks, confectioners, mimics, dancers, barbers, pimps, and parasites. There was such a jostling, overturning, shouting and brawling, he adds, when this mixed company commenced their march in the morning, that it might have been imagined hell had let loose its inhabitants. The train of Thomas à-Becket, as before noticed, was a choice specimen of Norman magnificence. But after all, the grandeur displayed by the Normans was only superficial, their cavalcades more resembling an Asiatic caravan than well-ordered processions. And oftentimes they were mere bands of robbers; for the king's purveyors scoured the country around for provisions, while the cavalcade was on its route, paying for just what they pleased and no more; and the prelates and barons, as they made their progresses, were not slow in following the royal example.

The mode of travelling, however, adopted by the Norman kings, prelates, and barons may not wholly be attributable to their love of display and magnificence. As there were but few places for the entertainment of travellers, it was necessary to have numerous attendants for the erection of tents wherein to rest after a long day's march, and instruments for the cooking of their food. Then, again, during a part of the time, it was dangerous to travel without men of arms; for not only were the castles abodes of predatory nobles ever ready to plunder those whom they could outnumber, but the forests concealed bands of Saxon outlaws who were ever on the watch to rob and kill the hated Normans.

Outlaws.—It is in legend and ballad, rather than in chronicle, that traces are to be found of large numbers of Saxons who frequented the royal forests of England as outlaws: men who, armed with bows and arrows, defied the just legal enactments against robbery, and disregarded the punishments denounced against those who "offended against the king relative to his venison." It has been seen that when Richard the Lion-hearted returned from Palestine, he went "to see Clipstone and the forests of Sherwood;" and Thierry may be correct in his supposition that it was something more which took him there, than merely to enjoy the charm of the woodland scenery. The whole of the band, he says, that ranged the vast woodland districts of Derby, Nottingham, and Yorkshire, were the remnants of the old Saxon race who had lived in this condition of defiance to the Norman oppression, from the time of Hereward, the same type of generous robbers and redressors of wrongs, as the famous Cumberland bandits, Adam Bell, and William of Cloudesly. The famous Robert Hode, or, as he is called in ballad, Robin Hood, who appears to have been a real personage, or whose name may have been adopted by successive outlaws, is the never-ending protest of the Saxons against the misrule of the Normans. The first distinct mention of Robin Hood is made by Fordun, a Scotch historian of the fourteenth century, but who he was, and in what reign he figured, is uncertain. It is clear, however, that he was one of those brave Saxons who exercised a species of democratic justice against aristocratic injustice. It was a contest of robber against robber, and the popular admiration of the bold outlaw appears to have been unbounded. Minstrels have recorded his fame in their never-dying songs; telling how he took the goods of the rich wherewith to feed the oppressed Saxon serf; how he defied the cruel forest-laws by killing venison in spite of earl and sheriff; and how he fought and won many a victory over armed Norman travellers. And there can be no wonder that such a hero of the forest acquired fame by his bold daring. The great body of the people were a suffering race, the peasant being in every respect in bondage under their Norman masters. Their privations, and the insults they endured, went on amidst a smouldering hatred till the reign of Richard II., and the Robin Hood ballads not only long kept alive the detestation of the Norman oppressors, but has preserved to all time the fame of their hero. In song, he has the same attributes of bravery and generosity with which history has invested the character of King Richard, without any of the traits of ferocity which tainted that character. If he was a robber, which is doubtful in the true sense of the word, he was, as song describes him—

"The gentlest thief that ever was;"

and the quaint old Fuller places him among his Worthies, "not for his thieving, but for his gentleness."

Domestic Life.—The domestic life of this period forms a singular contrast to the magnificence displayed by the king and his nobles in public. The Normans introduced a more stately and durable style of architecture, but the interior of their palaces and castles did not correspond with the exterior. For carpets they used straw and rushes; and for beds, at the very best, a rug laid upon a wooden bench or spread upon the floor. Several estates were held by the tenure of finding clean straw for the king's bed, and litter for his chamber; and it is recorded as a proof of Thomas à-Becket's elegant manner of living, that he had the floor of his dining-hall strewed with clean straw or hay every morning in winter; and with fresh rushes and green boughs of trees every day in summer. As regards furniture, there were apparently but few additions or improvements. The Bayeux tapestry displays the same description of chairs and tables used in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as those used by the Anglo-Saxons, although some of them belonging to the kings, prelates, and barons, were more elaborately ornamented. The table furniture was also of the

same description as that in use in the former period; but in the reign of King John, salt-cellars are mentioned. In the Close Rolls a mark of gold is ordered, to make one for the royal table, and 29*s.* 6*d.* to be paid for a silver salt-cellar, gilt within and without. In the Rolls, fine cotton for three of the royal couches is mentioned, and linen sheets were in the days of King John used by the wealthy. In the earlier part of the period, walls were adorned with hangings of needlework and embroidery, but towards its close paintings on historical or fabulous subjects became fashionable. On the whole, however, there was little progress made in this age either in the elegance or comfort of domestic furniture.

Diet.—It is stated that the Anglo-Normans were more delicate in the choice and dressing of their food than the Anglo-Saxons. But whatever their refinements in gastronomy may have been, their meats, whether flesh or fowl, were still served up upon the spit to the guests at the festive board. The tables of the kings glittered with gold and silver plate, but there was little refinement displayed in the mode of eating. "Fingers were made before forks," is an old saying and true, for the Anglo-Normans thrust them into the rich dishes, and used them in tearing the flesh into morsels. It is clear, however, that the feasts of Norman nobles were distinguished by the rarity and costliness of their viands. John of Salisbury says that delicacies were procured from Constantinople, Palestine, Phœnicia, Alexandria, and Babylon; and Thomas à Becket is said to have given 5*l.* for a dish of eels, equivalent to 75*l.* of present money. There were but two stated meals in the day, dinner and supper. Their common proverb was:—

> To rise at five, to dine at nine,
> To sup at five, to bed at nine,
> Makes a man live to ninety-nine.

This proverb has been adduced as a proof of Anglo-Norman abstemiousness; but if this was the rule, there were exceptions. John of Salisbury says that he was present at a feast which commenced at three in the afternoon and was not over till midnight. Nor does it appear that even kings put the choicest viands—the peacock, crane, boar's head, &c.—before their guests, or entertained them with the choicest liquors—spiced wines, hippocras, pigment, morat, and mead; for Peter of Blois, in one of his letters, which refers to an entertainment given by Henry II. to his knights and nobles, says:—"I often wonder how one, who has been used to the service of scholarship and the camps of learning, can endure the annoyance of a court life. Among courtiers there is no order, no plan, no moderation, either in food, in horse exercise, or in watchings. A priest or a soldier attached to the court has bread put before him which is neither kneaded nor leavened, made of the dregs of beer—bread like lead, full of bran and unbaked; wine spoiled by either being sour or mouldy; thick, greasy, rancid, tasting of pitch, and vapid. I have sometimes seen wine so full of dregs put before noblemen that they were compelled rather to filter than to drink it, with their eyes shut and their teeth closed, with loathing and retching. The beer at court is horrid to taste and filthy to look at. On account of the great demand, meat, whether sweet or not, is sold alike; the fish four days old, yet its stinking does not lessen its pri The servants care nothing whatever whether t unlucky guests are sick or dead, provided there a fuller dishes sent up to their masters' tables. Inde the tables are filled sometimes with carrion, and t guest's stomachs sometimes thus become the tombs those who die in the course of nature. Many m deaths would ensue from this putrid food, were it n that the greediness of the stomach, which, like a wh pool that will suck in anything, and by the help powerful exercise gets rid of everything." Peter Blois intimates that if there had been any refineme in gastronomy, the Normans had in his day beco degenerated in this respect, for he says that knights went forth to battle laden with all kinds provisions, and that they carried cheeses instead lances, and wine skins and spits instead of swords a spears. But this reads more like caricature th sober reality: like Shakspeare's description of Falsta preparation for the battle of Shrewsbury,

It is probable that Peter of Blois has overdrawn picture, for it is utterly at variance with the testim of other writers of this period. That cookery held in high estimation by the Normans is clear, some estates were held by the tenure of dressing particular dish of meat; whence it may be concei that a father would instruct his son carefully in art, from skill in which depended his retention of family estate. Of the composition of many of kinds of dishes made at that period—as dellegrc manpigyrnum, and karampie—we have no knowledg and some kind of provisions eaten, as the crane a peacock, no modern gormand would ever think having on his table. The bread of the period was various kinds, as the *panis* piperatus, which was ma of fine flour mixed with spices; and simnel and wast cakes, also, made of the finest flour, and which w rarely seen except at the tables of kings, nobles, an the clergy. The middle class used bread made flour unrefined, or wheat meal, while the bread of th serf was made of the meal of rye, barley, or oats.

CORN SACKS AND STORE.

From the proverb which speaks of the customa hour of retiring to rest being nine o'clock in th evening, some have concluded that the Conquer ordained that all fires and lights should be exti

guished on the ringing of the curfew-bell at sunset in summer, and about eight or nine in winter. It seems probable, however, that the same custom prevailed anterior to the Conquest as it did in France, Spain, Italy, Scotland, and probably in most of the countries of Europe. It was a wise precaution, for as houses were generally constructed with wood, it had a tendency to prevent conflagrations. But the sound of the curfew-bell did not always receive attention, for frequent fires are mentioned by an old chronicler, as one of the great inconveniences of city life in London. Indeed, William of Malmesbury relates that Henry I. restored the use of lamps and candles at court after the ringing of the curfew, which had been prohibited by his predecessor, and his subjects no doubt followed his example. The fact, also, of feasts being prolonged till midnight, proves that the sound of the curfew-bell was frequently unheeded.

CURFEW BELL TOWER.

Costume.—The Anglo-Saxons had, during the reign of Edward the Confessor, so closely imitated the dress of the Normans, that, during the reign of William the Conqueror, the ordinary costume of the people remained similar to what it had been before the Conquest. It consisted of the tunic, cloak, long tight *chausses* or hose, sometimes bandaged round the leg with various colours, or crossed diagonally; shoes of various colours and short boots reaching above the ankle, with a plain band round their tops. There was, however, one essential particular in which the Normans differed from the Anglo-Saxons in their toilette—namely, the singular fashion of shaving the back of the head as well as the entire face. It was this that gave the spies sent by Harold to reconnoitre the camp of William the notion that the duke had more priests in his camp than warriors. As regards female costume, it differed more in name than in garment worn by Anglo-Saxon ladies. The gown became the robe, and the veil or head-cloth the *courre-chef*, whence the modern kerchief. The hair of females is rarely seen in illuminations at this time; but when it is, it appears long and sometimes plaited. "Once, however," as Fairholt observes, "established in England, and revelling in riches and rapine procured from its inhabitants, the courtiers of the Conqueror gave way to their ostentatious love of finery, which increased during his reign, and in that of Rufus arrived at its height, produced a total change in the appearance of the people." The king, the courtiers, and the clergy alike became smitten with the love of attire, which was both whimsical in shape and expensive in material. The tunic had sleeves long enough not only to cover but to hang considerably below the hand, while behind it trailed upon the ground: and the boot or shoe had peaked toes, some of which terminated like the tail of a scorpion, and others curled round like a ram's horn. The length of their garments, and the love of amplitude that characterised the fashionables of this period, induced the Anglo-Normans to discard close shaving and to allow their hair and beard to vie with their apparel in length and inconvenience. So long was the hair and so bushy the beard, that Ordericus Vitalis compared men to "filthy goats." This fashion was not

NORMAN MALE AND FEMALE COSTUMES.

only inveighed against from the pulpit, but formed matter for grave debate in council. It is related that Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, refused his benediction on Ash Wednesday to all those who refused to cut their hair; and that a Norman prelate, Serlo d'Abon,

after preaching against beards before Henry I., turned barber—cropping not only that of the king but of his whole congregation with a pair of scissors. But it was in vain that the church endeavoured to repress this fashion: in the reign of Stephen "the ringlets of the men made them look like women," and if they were not sufficiently luxurious, false hair was used to increase its length. Female costume was equally extravagant in shape and expensive in material as that worn by gentlemen. In illuminations, both the sleeves of their robes and their veils appear knotted up to prevent their trailing on the ground. Their gowns, also, like the tunics of the gentlemen, were excessively ample, and either lay in folds about their feet, or trailed at length behind them. In one illumination of the period which is designed to represent Christ's temptation, the illuminator has satirically dressed Satan in the full costume of a fashionable Anglo-Norman lady. His infernal Majesty is represented with a waist charmingly slender, its shape being admirably preserved by tight lacing from the waist upward, the ornamental tag depending from the last hole in the bodice. His long sleeves are knotted on his arm, and his gown open from the right hip downward, gathered in a knot at his feet. In the dress of their hair, the ladies far outdid the doings of gentlemen. It was worn in long plaits, sometimes reaching down to the feet, and was either bound with ribbons, or dressed in silk coverings of variegated colours. Such were the chief features of male and female costume from the reign of William Rufus to that of Henry II., when it assumed a more becoming and graceful style. The monumental effigies of that period exhibit full-flowing robes of a moderate length, girded with an ornamental waist-belt; mantles fastened on the shoulders or breast by fibulæ; *chausses* or long hose; shoes or boots sometimes embroidered; caps of various forms; and jewelled gloves. Henry also introduced the short cloak of Anjou, and the old Norman fashion of cropping the hair and shaving the beard. The beard and moustache, however, were again worn in the reign of Richard I., and in that of his successor John: the laity being at that period liberated from all legislative interference in the matter of costume. In the reign of Henry II., ladies, also, adopted a more graceful dress; their robes being at that time girded round their waist, and having tight sleeves which reached only to their girdles. Their mantles, also, hung gracefully from their shoulders, and their hair was almost concealed by the veil kerchief or wimple, which was sometimes brought together under the chin and fastened by a band. Throughout the period the dresses of the Normans, both male and female, were made of costly material, and were frequently embroidered and ornamented with gold, pearl, and precious stones. Bloet, bishop of Lincoln, presented Henry I. with a cloak of exquisite fine cloth, lined with black sables with white spots, which cost 100*l*., equal to 1500*l*. of present money; and a cloak worn by Richard I. is described as being striped in straight lines adorned with half moons of solid silver, and almost covered with shining orbs, in imitation of the system of the heavenly bodies. Ladies wore collars of pearl or precious stones about their necks, and costly rings on their fingers. The ecclesiastical costume of the period is chiefly remarkable for the increase of ornament adopted by the superior clergy, their chasubles being richly bordered, and sometimes adorned with jewels. Their dalmatics varied from those worn by Anglo-Saxon prelates in being open at the sides, and those like the chasubles were richly ornamented. In the cap worn by some of the prelates, the first approach to a mitre is visible, it having pendant bands called the *vittæ* or *ansulæ*, which always appear upon mitres, and sometimes upon crowns. In order to distinguish them from other people, the Jews during this period were compelled to wear square yellow caps; those of the Anglo-Normans being of various shapes or colours, and more or less ornamented according to the taste and rank of the wearers. Generally they were made of cloth or fur, and those of kings, earls, and barons, were adorned with pearls and precious stones.

The ordinary costume of the Norman soldiers was a military tunic or hauberk, which fitted closely to the body, being slit a little way up in the centre, both before and behind, for the convenience of riding: occasionally, however, ending in close-fitting trousers at the knee. It was of German origin, and Meyrick conceives that it was called hauberk from *hauen*, to hew or cut, and *berg*, a defence—that is, a protection against cuts or stabs. Meyrick says, "It was put on, probably, by first drawing it on the thighs where it sits wide, and then putting the arms into the sleeves which hang loosely, reaching not much below the elbow, as was the case with the Saxon flat-ringed tunic. The hood attached to it was then brought over the head, and the opening on the chest covered by a square piece, through which were passed straps that fastened behind, hanging down with tasselated terminations, as did also the strap which drew the hood, or capuchon, as it was called, tight round the forehead. The hood appears to have covered the head and the conical helmet placed over it. The sleeves of the hauberk were wide, reaching only to the elbow, and were covered with rings, and its body appears to have been formed of straps of leather fastened on a body of quilted cloth crossing each other diagonally, and leaving angular spaces in the centre where knobs of steel were placed as an additional protection. The legs were protected by ringed mail, and the shoes of horsemen were curved downward to keep the toes slipping from the stirrup. Four other kinds of armour are exhibited in figures of this period: the mascled, tegulated, scale, and "rustred armour." The mascles were lozenge-shaped plates of metal fastened on the hauberk, through holes at each corner, and so worked one over the other that no openings were discernible. Tegulated armour was formed of little square plates covering each other in the manner of tiles, and sown upon a hauberk without sleeves or hood. Scale armour was formed of a series of overlapping scales, formed of leather or metal, in imitation of the scales of a fish; and "rustred armour" consisted of rows of rings placed flat over each other, so that two of the upper row partially covered one in that below, and thus filled up all interstices, while free motion was allowed the wearer. This military costume was worn by the

knights of the period. The archers who did great service to William at Hastings, and who made the bow for a long period the chief strength of the English lines, had a different costume. In the Bayeaux Tapestry their dress is variously represented. Thus, one is dressed in a close vest with wide breeches to the knee: another in full breeches gathered above and below the knee, and ornamented with large red spots; while a third wears a steel cap with a projecting nasal like the knights, and a close-fitting dress reaching to the knee, of ringed mail formed of metal rings sown upon leather or cloth. The quiver appears to have been either suspended from the waist or slung over the shoulder.

Superstition.—The Anglo-Normans were equally superstitious as were the Anglo-Saxons. The path of their existence was strewed with omens, superstitious observances, and prodigies. If they met a hare, or a woman with dishevelled locks, or a blind or lame man, or even a monk, it was deemed a sign of some impending calamity; but if, on the other hand, they met a wolf, from which they had real cause for fear, or St. Martin's bird flew from right to left, or if they heard distant thunder, or were met by a deformed or leprous man, they deemed it a sign of some coming good fortune. The credulity of the age was unbounded. Even the wisest and best of the historians and writers of the period record miracles, visions, and enchantments as grave matters of fact. Matthew Paris says that it pleased the Lord Jesus to irradiate the glorious martyr Thomas à-Becket with many miracles, so that none who approached his tomb in faith returned without a cure. Strength, he says, was restored to the lame, hearing to the deaf, sight to the blind, speech to the dumb, health to lepers, and life to the dead. No examples are given, but yet it is thus broadly stated that such miracles were performed, and credulous readers have believed the tale. Giraldus Cambrensis, also, gravely records that one devil acted as butler to a baron with great fidelity, and another was a very diligent and learned monk, and a mighty favourite of his archbishop, whom he was wont to entertain with a relation of ancient histories and marvellous events. But this clerical devil one day forgot himself, and cut short his career as a clerk. Having related that after the incarnation the devils lost their power over mankind and were obliged to flee, some throwing themselves into the sea, and others concealing themselves in hollow trees or in the clefts of rocks; he added, "I myself plunged into a certain fountain." The secret was out, and Giraldus says that this clerical devil, finding he had blabbed, with a face covered with blushes, left the room and was never seen again.

Sepulture.—Every nation has their peculiar rites of sepulture, and the Anglo-Normans had theirs. At the decease of a person, the nearest relation closed the eyelids of the dead, after which the face was covered with a linen cloth, and the body was washed and laid out for burial. In this period the dead were commonly buried without the protection of a coffin, coffins being confined to those of rank and fortune. The Conqueror was interred in a chest or coffin formed of solid masonry; but stone coffins and sarcophagi or tombs came in use as seen under the head of architecture. Kings were sometimes embalmed after death as was Henry I., and their obsequies were performed with great splendour. Kings, also, as well as nobles and prelates, were buried with the insignia of their rank. Thus, the body of Henry II. was buried in royal robes: the head being adorned with a golden crown, the hands covered with gloves, and the feet with shoes embroidered with gold-work, while a sword was girded upon its side, and its fingers were clenched round a sceptre. Affection for the dead seems generally to have prevailed throughout this period, except when a person died under the ban of excommunication. Taught by the clergy that the body of the excommunicated was the special property of Satan, no tears were shed over it, and no rites performed. It was thrown into any hole or corner of unconsecrated earth, silently and secretly, as a thing polluted and accursed of God and man.

Sports and Pastimes.—The national character of this period may be more fully illustrated by a notice of sports and pastimes. The favourite diversions of the Anglo-Normans were martial sports called tournaments. When a prince resolved to hold a tournament, he sent heralds to the neighbouring courts and countries to publish his design, and invite all knights to honour the solemnity with their presence. Those who accepted the invitation to enter the lists hung up their shields in a neighbouring monastery, to be inspected both by knights and ladies; and if a lady touched it with a wand, it was considered an accusation of its owner. The knight had done that lady some wrong, supposed or real, and he must answer for his conduct before he entered the lists. He was brought before the judge of the tournament and tried with great solemnity, and if adjudged guilty of any conduct unworthy of a brave and courteous knight, he was not allowed to take part in the tournament. Tournaments were held in an open space surrounded by strong palings and scaffolding, with seats for the spectators. Ladies, in whose honour the knights were to fight, usually conducted them to the lists; and troubadours and minstrels in picturesque dresses brightened the scene. All the feats of war, from the single-combat to the general action, were represented in these martial diversions; and at the close of the day the judges declared the victors, and the ladies distributed the prizes. The victors for a brief period became heroes. They were conducted in triumph to the palace; their armour was taken off by ladies, and then, dressed in rich robes, they took their seat at the table of their sovereign, where they were treated with the greatest distinction.

The tournament had its origin in France, where it long flourished before it was introduced into England. It was not allowed to be held in England before the reign of King Richard—probably from the great danger incurred in the encounters between knight and knight, and from the ruinous expense with which such a diversion was attended. It is true, tournaments were held in the turbulent reign of King Stephen, but that was an age when barons did as they pleased. His successor, Henry II., strictly prohibited their being held in England, and with good reason; for it was while attending tournaments on the Continent that his sons got up their rebellions against his

parental and kingly authority. Their warlike sports inflamed their martial ardour, and added fire to the flames of ambition which burned in their bosoms. Richard himself had engaged in the lists in tournaments held by the king of France, and had, while thus engaged, gathered around him knightly companions to dispute dominion with his father Henry. Is is said that when he became king, he allowed tournaments to be celebrated in England because he had observed that they contributed to make French knights more skilful in the use of their arms in battle than his own; an assertion not borne out by historical facts. It would rather appear that Richard permitted tournaments to be held in his kingdom for two reasons; first, that he himself was fond of the warlike diversion, and second, because they produced revenue, he having imposed a tax on all who entered the lists. But whatever may have been his motive, it is certain that, from his reign, for a very long period tournaments were among the most popular pastimes of the people of England.

Other favourite diversions among the Anglo-Normans were, hunting and hawking. The jealous care with which the Norman kings protected the deer to the great misery of the people, has received notice in a former page. Every offender detected in the act of hunting in the royal forests was subject to the loss of life and limb; and the very dog that strayed therein, if caught, was lamed by the amputation of one of its claws, unless redeemed by the owner. The example thus set by the sovereign was closely imitated by the barons. They, too, had their enclosures for the preservation of game, in the formation of which, by a lawless exercise of power, they often drove the peasantry from their meadows, fields, and pasture-lands. Subsequent to the reign of the Red King William II., the restrictive character of the game-laws was somewhat abated. By a charter of Henry I., the citizens of London were allowed to have their chases for hunting; but the peasant was still forbidden to enjoy the pastime. That sport was reserved for the king and the prelate; the baron and the lady of high-born birth. The diversions of hunting and hawking were, with them, the supreme felicity of life. John of Salisbury says that they pursued wild beasts with greater fury than the enemies of their country; and that by the keenness with which they followed this mode of life, they became almost as great monsters and savages as the animals they hunted. Hawking was a sport followed with equal keenness as that of hunting. Falconries were as distinct marks of high rank as the spurs of knighthood, or heraldic insignia. It was a sport for a long time forbidden to all except the great and the noble; but, by a clause in the Great Charter, every freeman was allowed to have in his wood, eyries of falcons, eagles, hawks, sparhawks, and herons. Most of the monasteries had stores of hawks for the amusement of the monks, and so keenly did they follow the sport, that Peter of Blois censures them for caring more for birds than sheep; and for hallooing the falcon upon its quarry with the same voice that had been consecrated to chant the praises of God. Hawking, also, was a favourite pastime of the Anglo-Norman ladies, which John of Salisbury adduces as a proof that it was a frivolous amusement.

Horse-racing was practised among Saxons, but not to any extent. Such race in Smithfield, which was then, as it h recent times, the great cattle market of Lo these races only consisted of the competi or three horses ridden by jockeys, and wa but the germ of the horse-racing of the Among yeomen and burgesses, a sport quintain, which may be considered as a the tournament, was a favourite divers sport consisted of a pole fixed firmly in t across the top of which was fixed a piece turn upon a spindle, having at one end o and at the other a sandbag. Those who this sport galloped against the quintain the board with a couched pole, and if th not make a rapid escape, the heavy sand other extremity wheeled round and s between the shoulders, to the great am the spectators. The water quintain v

THE QUINTAIN.

favourite pastime of the Londoners. It scribed by Fitz-Stephen:—"A shield is pole fixed in the midst of the river—the and a boat is driven with violence by mar the stream of the river. On the prow c stands a young man, who, in passing, tilts shield with a spear. If the spear breaks ar his station, he gains his prize; but if not, h into the river. To prevent his being drow is moored both sides of the shield, filled men, who rescue him. The bridges, w houses are crowded with spectators read out into loud bursts of laughter." Other a were of a rustic character, some of whi deemed as a supplementary part of th training of the people; such as wrestl was a common pastime from London to end, from the west to the north. Yeome for prizes of no mean value, as a ram o gold ring, or a pipe of wine." The game staff was also popular. According to b Robin Hood had a hunt in Sherwood Fo tanner of Nottingham, whose staff of oak feet and a half long. Other amusements character were, running, leaping, throw

and darts, and shooting with bows and arrows. In large towns the burgesses diverted themselves with foot-ball, and bear and bull-hunting. School-boys were allowed to amuse themselves with the barbarous sport of cock-fighting. On Shrove Tuesday each scholar was permitted to bring a fighting-cock into the school-room, which, for the day, became a cock-pit for the diversion of the urchins. In winter, boys were accustomed to skate with the shank bones of sheep tied under their shoes, at the same time tilting against each other with pointless spears.

Among in-door amusements were theatrical entertainments—ecclesiastical and secular. The ecclesiastical plays were composed by the clergy, and were acted by them and their pupils. They consisted of representations of events or actions recorded in Scripture, or the lives of the saints. Sometimes they were played before the public, for Fitz-Stephen says that London had religious plays, which were representations of miracles wrought by confessors, and of the patience of martyrs under suffering. As regards secular plays, they appear to have consisted only of comic tales, intermingled with jests and ribaldry. They were acted by strolling-players, chiefly in the courts of kings and the castles of the barons. Their exhibitions were of an immoral character, and probably the clergy composed their ecclesiastical plays as a counteracting influence. Other diversions were afforded by jugglers and buffoons. The Anglo-Norman juggler made knives and balls circle through his hands, and balanced his wheel and his sword as

SWORD DANCE.

adroitly as the modern conjuror; and the buffoon amused his audience with his ribald jests as effectually as the modern clown. In towns, the bearward, with his monkey and his drum, met with a welcome reception; and in country revels, the taborer and the bagpiper, the dancers and the minstrels were hailed with delight by the peasantry. "Musical girls," indeed, tumbled before knight and peasant, as the daughter of Herodias "tumbled before Herod." The most attractive amusement to both high and low was, also, the most pernicious. Gambling was often carried to a great excess. Chess was known, but the rattle of the dice was more practised than the marshalling of bishop and knight. Both were considered to be an integral part of the education of all those who aspired to the honour of knighthood. The passion for gaming often led to great social evils. Peter of Blois attributes the profligacy of a young nobleman to his being taught to play at dice by his father in early youth; and Matthew Paris censures the English barons, who had revolted from King John, for spending their time in London in eating, drinking, and dice-playing, when they should have been in arms in the field. Such was the rage for gambling that the clergy and prelates are said to have spent much of their time in playing at chess and dice. It had become such a dangerous passion that several canons and laws were made to restrain it, but to very little purpose. Some of these laws were very curious specimens of class legislation. Thus one law ordained that no man in the army was to play at any game for money, except the knights and clergy, and they were not to lose more than twenty shillings in any one day. If the men-at-arms played by themselves—that is, without their masters looking on and permitting—they were to be whipped; and mariners so offending were to be dipped in the sea on three successive mornings, "after the usage of sailors." These regulations were evidently designed to prevent quarrels, which were the natural consequence of gambling, and which often led to serious frays. It is recorded of John, son of King Henry, that he "fell at variance at chess with Falco Guarine, and John broke Falco's head with the chess-board, and then Falco gave him such a blow that he almost killed him." The laws and regulations, however, concerning the practice of gaming were rendered nugatory by the examples of those by whom they were promulgated; for if the kings and the barons, the prelates and the clergy played at games of chance without restraint, why not the people?

"Example hath a louder tongue than precept."

HOUSE OF PLANTAGENET.

CHAPTER I.

Civil and Military History, from the Accession of Henry III., A.D. 1216, to the Deposition of Richard II., A.D. 13

SECTION I.

HENRY III., SURNAMED OF WINCHESTER.

The death of King John was a providential event, both for his family and his country. By that event England was rescued from a great dilemma. While he lived, there appeared to be only the choice of two evils: either to submit to his tyrannical rule, or be governed by an ambitious young prince, who would have regarded England as a fief of France, and have smothered the growth of its independence. A wise Providence ordered otherwise. No sooner was John buried at Worcester than the earl of Pembroke, marshal of England, marched with the royal army and prince Henry, the eldest son of King John, to the city of Gloucester; where, on the 28th of October, A.D. 1216, the boy prince—for he was only ten years old—was crowned by Gualo, the Pope's legate, king of England. The ceremony was performed in more haste than pomp and show. As the crown had been lost in the Wash with the rest of the regalia, a fillet of gold was placed on the boy's head; and in the presence of three bishops, as many earls, four barons, and a few abbots and friars, the young prince took the usual oaths "upon the gospels and relics of saints," and, having paid homage to the Pope for his kingdom, was "made" king.

The tender age of the young monarch rendered it necessary that there should be a protector of the kingdom. Accordingly, at a great council held at Bristol, on the 11th of November, the earl of Pembroke was chosen to that high office, with the title of *Rector Regis et Regni*—"Protector of the King and the Kingdom"—a trust which he discharged with honour, wisdom, and success. One of his first acts was to renew the Great Charter which John had signed at Runnymead: at the same time carefully revising some of its clauses, to which objections had been made by the barons in the interest of Prince Louis; and leaving others open for discussion when all the barons should become so far reconciled as to meet again in solemn council. That reconciliation was earnestly sought by the Protector. Letters were sent to the discontented barons, urging them to return and submit to the young king's government, and solemnly promising indemnity for the past, and security for the future. Several of the more powerful barons—as the earls of Salisbury, Arundel, and Warrenne—were won over by these well-timed letters, and others only waited for an opportunity to follow their example. At the same time, Gualo, the Pope's legate, used his weapons in support of the boy-king he had c both Louis and all his adherents were plac the ban of excommunication.

At the death of King John, Prince Louis engaged in the siege of Dover. On hearin event, he pressed that siege with ten-fold His efforts were coupled with tempting offe heroic governor, Hubert de Burgh; but ne power nor his offers prevailed: the fideli Burgh was incorruptible, and his defence of on the cliffs invincible. The siege was ra Louis hastened to London, still hoping to crown of England. The citizens of London his favour: on the 6th of November the Tow had hitherto held out against him, was sur into his hands. Emboldened by the suppo Londoners, Prince Louis marched to Hertf laid siege to and captured its castle. He, tured the castle of Berkhampstead. This las however, was rather a loss than a gain; for a quarrel *with* and the defection *of* one of his adherents—Robert Fitz-Walter—to whom he its custody. Success had made him arrogant. was a spirit of dislike growing up in the against his pretensions, and he unwisely foste spirit by his haughtiness. He marched fro hampstead to St. Albans, where his conduct en the minds of many against him, and especi clergy. He threatened to burn down the ma abbey if its abbot did not acknowledge hin king of England, and although he did not c threat into execution when the abbot sternly to comply with his demand, the abbey was on by the payment of a fine of eighty marks of si

The season of Christmas was now at hand truce was agreed upon till the second week Epiphany, which was afterwards prolonged t Easter, A.D. 1217. Meanwhile, both parties for the final struggle. Louis went to France and money, and Pembroke was actively eng recruiting in England and in gaining ove barons to the cause of King Henry. Louis Eugueraud de Coucy as his governor in F and, like his master, De Coucy governed arr The French, indeed, began to look upon the like the Normans before them, as "born slav it became evident to the English barons that secured the throne to the French prince, they impose upon themselves foreign masters. Th

therefore, a great reaction in the minds of the people while Louis was in France collecting troops. The French universally became to be considered, not as deliverers from a native tyranny, but as plunderers, whose excesses could not be endured by free-born Englishmen. Besides, the cause for which the French prince had been called into the country no longer existed: the tyrant against whom they had rebelled was in his tomb at Worcester, and Louis, therefore, was no longer wanted. He might have been convinced of this before he embarked for France; for one William de Collingham, at the head of a thousand gallant archers, would have taken him prisoner as he was on his way to the coast, had not the timely aid of the French fleet prevented his capture. On his return there was a sterner opposition displayed. The armistice was still existing; but regardless of this, the mariners of the Cinque Ports captured several of his vessels, for which he took revenge on Sandwich, which he burned to the ground.

The truce having expired, Louis once more laid siege to Dover; while Pembroke recommenced hostilities by laying siege to the castle of Mount Sorel, in Leicestershire. In this enterprise Pembroke was unsuccessful. The count of Perche, with six hundred knights and twenty thousand men—French, English, Flemings, and other mercenaries—marched from London to the relief of the castle, and the siege was raised. The count of Perche, with his "wicked French freebooters," as an old chronicler calls them, now marched to Lincoln, committing fearful havoc in their route: the inhabitants were plundered, and churches and monasteries wantonly destroyed. The castle of Lincoln was besieged, but it was bravely defended by a woman—Nichola de Camville, the widow of its hereditary governor. While the count was engaged in this siege, Pembroke called out the tenants of the crown, and hastened to its relief. Previous to marching, his army was invested with a sacred character by Gualo, the legate. The war became a sort of crusade. Crosses were sewn upon the breasts of the soldiers, and they were promised all the privileges of crusaders. To animate them, also, Gualo, who had every Sunday and holiday pronounced the sentence of excommunication against the partisans of Louis, now hurled the thunders of the Church against him personally. The war had, therefore, assumed the character of a crusade against the French army. The count of Perche was still besieging the castle of Lincoln when Pembroke's army approached the walls of the city. Deeming himself safe within its walls, he did not lead out his forces against Pembroke's army, but kept battering away at the walls of the castle, resolving to reduce that first, and then to fight in the open field. He never dreamt that his enemy would enter the walled town and engage him in the narrow streets of Lincoln. On a sudden, however, he found himself engaged in a street-fight under the most disadvantageous circumstances. He had well-mounted knights, but cavalry was of no use in such close quarters. His knights were wounded and dismounted, and at length were compelled to surrender in a mass. There was a merciless slaughter in the narrow streets of Lincoln, and among the slain was the count of Perche, who scorned to surrender to "any English traitor." Such was the victory which, from its easy accomplishment, is called in history "The Fair of Lincoln." The burgesses of the city espoused the cause of Prince Louis, for which they paid dearly. Their city was given up to pillage—one of the grand privileges of crusaders—and many of its inhabitants perished in their flight over the river Witham.

It was on hearing of this disaster that Prince Louis raised the siege of Dover, and hastened to London. It was followed by a great naval success. At this time, another fleet and army were being prepared in France to aid Louis in his struggle for the English crown. Blanche of Castile, the wife of Louis, was said to be gathering these reinforcements in aid of her husband; for Philip, king of France, was afraid of acting openly in the matter lest he should bring down upon his head the curse of the Church. It was in August that this fleet, consisting of eighty large ships and several smaller vessels, sailed from Calais. Eustace, a famous pirate monk of the age, was its commander. On board there were three hundred knights and a numerous body of infantry, and their purpose was to effect a landing on the Thames, and join Prince Louis in London. But that object was never accomplished. As they were making for the estuary of the Thames, they were attacked by De Burgh, the hero of Dover Castle, who had only forty vessels under his command, but who, with this small armament, bore down upon the French fleet with such irresistible fury, that, with the exception of fifteen vessels, the whole of the French fleet was either captured or destroyed. It is related that De Burgh caused powdered quick-lime to be scattered in the air, which the wind carried into the faces of his enemies; but the iron beaks of his galleys and his boarding-axes proved more formidable than the quick-lime. The victory was complete. From that time the cause of Louis was hopeless. Negotiations followed, and on the 11th of September a treaty was signed on an islet of the Thames near Kingston, by which Louis renounced his pretensions to the crown of England; and Pembroke granted a complete amnesty, with a participation in all privileges to his English adherents. Three days after, a safe conduct was granted to Louis, and he was honourably escorted to the sea-side by the earl of Pembroke, from whence he sailed with his adventurers to France.

Pembroke strictly observed the conditions of this treaty. All the barons who had adhered to the cause of the French prince were restored to their estates and honours. But the Pope's legate, Gualo, acted in a different spirit towards the clergy who had favoured Louis: all of them who had been excommunicated being now banished from the kingdom. Unfortunately for the country, the regent Pembroke died in March A.D. 1219. Before he died, however, he had perfected the great Charter, wrung from King John by the barons, by a "Charter of the Forests," in which the terrible penalties for destroying the king's deer were abolished, and the milder punishments of fines or imprisonment substituted. Pembroke extended this Charter to Ireland; and he provided that it should live in the popular mind throughout England, by being read in the county courts periodically. While protector, he omitted nothing

that might contribute to the honour of the king and the welfare of the country. He introduced no sweeping changes in the laws, but he did that which was wiser and better—he amended them with wisdom and moderation, thus leaving a noble example to future English statesmen.

Pembroke was succeeded in the protectorship by Huburt de Burgh, while the young king's person was committed to the care of Peter des Roches, a Poictevin by birth, bishop of Winchester. These soon became rivals. De Burgh was the most popular with the English people, but Des Roches ruled at court. Dissensions followed, but dangerous consequences were prevented by the skill of Pandulph, who had again become legate in England. In May, A.D. 1220, Henry was re-crowned: Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, who had been permitted by the Pope to return to England, performing the ceremony. In that same year, Pandulph returned to Rome. Previous to his return he had demanded in the name of the people that no baron should hold more than two of the royal castles. It was so ordained, but little heed was paid to the order. Many of the barons, chiefly foreigners, pretended that they held their fortresses in trust till the king came of age, and refused to give them up. De Burgh demanded their surrender, but Des Roches favoured their retention. Plots and conspiracies followed. In the hope of restoring peace, De Burgh, in the year 1223, obtained a bull from the Pope, declaring the young king, now sixteen years old, to be of age to govern the kingdom without protectors. This bull was accompanied by a command to the barons to deliver up the royal castles forthwith. They were, however, still recusant, and De Burgh proceeded to take them by force of arms. In the course of the year 1224 most of them were captured: and at Bedford, eighty of the foreign garrison, who had committed frightful excesses in the neighbouring country, were hanged. De Burgh, who was not a cruel man, resorted to this severity as a warning to the foreigners in the country, and it had a wholesome effect. Even Des Roches gave up the struggle with his rival. Under pretence of making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he quitted the kingdom, and many foreign adventurers followed his example. By this time the law had reasserted its supremacy, and peace was restored. Dreading the severity of De Burgh, and perhaps still more the ban of excommunication threatened by the archbishop of Canterbury, the recusant barons everywhere submitted to the crown.

By a secret clause of the treaty entered into between Louis and the protector Pembroke, the French prince had bound himself to give up all the castles in Normandy which had been wrested from King John, should he ever ascend the throne of France. He ascended that throne A.D. 1225, but he not only refused to fulfil his engagement, but overrun some parts of Guienne and Poitou, and captured the important maritime town of Rochelle. Ambassadors were sent to demand the fulfilment of the treaty of A.D. 1217, but the demand was answered by the above aggressions. Henry now summoned a Parliament—for that name was now coming into use—to meet at Westminster. When that Parliament assembled De Burgh asked for money to enable the king to recover his own. He asked an aid of a fifteenth upon all persons estates. That aid was granted, but under circumstances hitherto unknown in England. There were strict limitations defined as to the mode in which the money was to be used as well as raised. Here was a change, indeed! Former kings had demanded and obtained money, and spent it how they pleased: now the people asserted the right not only of granting it but how it should be expended. Nor was this all. The "aid" was not even granted until Henry had consented to ratify the charters of their liberties. On these conditions the subsidy was voted and its collection was immediately enforced: both the clergy and laity contributing a fifteenth of their substance for war with France. A large army was raised but to very little purpose. It was commanded by Richard earl of Cornwall, the king's brother, who landed at Bordeaux, and marched into Guienne; but at that time the French king had taken the cross against the Albigenses in the south of France—a Protestant people who were called heretics, and treated more cruelly than the infidel Saracens—and a papal legate threatened the English with excommunication if they raised obstacles to Louis in this "holy war," and a truce was agreed upon for one year: a time which was afterwards extended to A.D. 1229.

At the time of the extension of this truce the French king was dead, and was succeeded by his son Louis IX., then only twelve years of age. The minority of that young monarch was marked by great disorders in France, and if, instead of renewing the truce Henry had pursued the war with vigour, he might have recovered his foreign possessions. But Henry was no warrior. When the truce expired, he resolved to carry war into France, but when he arrived at Portsmouth, the shipping provided for the transport of his army was not ready, and he postponed his expedition till the following year. In that year, 1230, he did set sail for the Continent, but it was only to bring disgrace on himself, and dishonour on his forces. He landed at St. Malo, in Normandy, where he was joined by the Duke of Brittany, and everything wore a promising aspect. Henry, however, only advanced as far as Nantes, where, while the French were capturing some of his towns, he wasted his time and means in feasting and pageantries. Many of his poorer knights were obliged to sell their horses and arms to defray their expenses; and about the end of October the unwarlike Henry returned to England. The brave De Burgh had accompanied him in this expedition, and notwithstanding his known honour, valour, and ability, the king and his courtiers endeavoured to throw all the blame upon him; but the people attributed it to the king himself. They looked upon him as a trifler and a coward, and when he asked his parliament for money to replenish his bankrupt exchequer, it was refused.

The history of England for some years after this chiefly consists of court intrigues and contests for power. Des Roches, bishop of Winchester, had returned from his pilgrimage and again became the rival of Hubert de Burgh. And this time he triumphed. In the year 1232 the brave De Burgh was doomed to experience the proverbial ingratitude

of princes. Many circumstances contributed to his downfal. The envy and malice of Des Roches, and the foreign courtiers, being the most effectual. While on the Continent, Henry had received homage in Poitou and Guienne, and from that time his court became more foreign than English. De Burgh was surrounded with enemies—Des Roches being the most inveterate and formidable. He remembered his former defeat, and sought revenge. And he had it. The high office of justiciary had been conferred on De Burgh for life, but he was rudely deprived of it, and ordered to give an account of the disposal of the revenues of the crown during his administration. Many crimes were laid to his charge; the most heinous being that of gaining the King's affection by magic and enchantment! Perceiving that his enemies were too powerful for him, De Burgh fled and took refuge in Merton Abbey. Henry would have dragged him from this asylum, but his barons represented the danger he would incur by such an act, and he paused. De Burgh had been long obnoxious to the mayor and citizens of London for his stern resistance to Prince Louis, whom they had supported, and they were about to drag him from the altar of the abbey when Henry recalled his order. But De Burgh soon after fell into the king's hands through treachery. Having received a safe conduct from Henry, he left his asylum to visit his wife, who was sister to the king of Scots, and he had no sooner quitted it than he was pursued by three hundred armed men, sent by the faithless monarch to arrest him. De Burgh fled to a parish church in Essex, but he was dragged from the altar by his pursuers and conveyed to the Tower of London.

THE TOWER, FROM THE THAMES.

The bishops, however, raised such an indignant outcry against this violation of the sanctuary that Henry was compelled to have him conveyed safely back to the parish church. He was still, however, resolved to get De Burgh into his power. The church was surrounded by armed men who prevented any one from entering it with provisions, and the brave Hubert, who had scorned to surrender to the French when twice beleagured by them in Dover Castle, was compelled, from fear of starvation, to surrender to Henry, whose throne he had so valiantly supported. Henry was advised to put him to death, but his conscience would not allow him to commit so foul an act. He confiscated his estates, and imprisoned him in the castle of Devizes, from whence he made his escape, and went into Wales. Finally, De Burgh triumphed over the malice of his enemies. He became reconciled to the king, who restored him to his estates; but he never again took part in the administration of public affairs.

On the downfal of Hubert de Burgh, the post of chief minister was conferred on his rival Des Roches. He triumphed, but it was only for a season. Des Roches invited over many of his countrymen to England, on whom Henry bestowed all places of honour and profit. The days of the Conqueror had in a degree returned: foreigners swarmed round the court. Henry even provided rich heiresses for some of them to wed, and they began to look upon England as their home. Who so great in the kingdom at this time as these hungry Poictevins? So they reasoned among themselves; and they showed their importance by treating the English nobility with contempt. But the barons of England were not yet slaves. They who curbed the tyrant John could surely curb the insolence of these foreigners, and the will of the dastardly Henry. A number of them, with Pembroke's son at their head, remonstrated with him for giving the preference to foreigners rather than to his English subjects, and when Des Roches in the king's name returned a haughty answer, they retired from court, a sullen and discontented body. If *they* had lost the favour of the king, *he* had now lost their affections. Twice he summoned them to meet him in parliament, and twice they refused to obey his summons. They would neither meet him at Oxford nor at Westminster. The spirit of nationality was aroused. Henry was plainly told that if he did not dismiss Des Roches and his Poictevin favourites from court, they would drive both him and them out of the kingdom. The barons knew their power, and had they remained united, their object would have been at once accomplished. Both Henry and his minister were alarmed at their threat, and in order to divert the storm which was gathering around them, a scheme was devised to divide the barons, which proved successful. Many of them were gained over to the court by favours and fair promises, and the earl of Pembroke, still standing firm in his patriotism, he was decoyed into Ireland by Des Roches, where he was basely murdered. But though by his craft this ambitious prelate broke up the confederacy of the barons, his triumph was evanescent. What the barons failed to effect was brought about by one of his own order. Grown bolder by success, he confiscated the estates of several English nobles, and insolently declared in his place at Court, that the barons of England were inferior in rank and condition to

those of France. Edmund, archbishop of Canterbury, now took up the national cause. He threatened Henry with excommunication if he did not instantly dismiss Des Roches and his associates, and trembling for his fate, the king commanded him to retire to his own diocese, and his Poictevin favourites to go about their business. A new administration was formed, in which the primate had great sway, and from which the people entertained hopes of a better government. This occurred A.D. 1234.

For a time the country *was* better governed; the Charters being the basis of the administration. But Henry, though he submitted to archbishop Edmund's sway, was not favourable to his mode of government. His dislike of the English barons and the Charters grew with his years; and there was no attempt made by the barons to remove his prejudices. He was unpopular with them and with the people at large. His station was not too high for the wits of the age to hurl their shafts at him. It was not an age of printing, but men could write, and lips could disseminate widely what was written. It was an age when men found the means of showing their contempt of character by written and oral satire. And Henry's character was vulnerable in many points of view, of which the satirical ballad-makers were not slow in taking advantage. His failures on the Continent—the second of which will be presently recorded—especially was made the subject of lampoons. Thus, in one of the Anglo-Norman satires, his majesty is made to say that he would certainly take Paris; that he would set fire to the river Seine; that he would burn all the French mills; and that it would be a terrible thing if the French had no bread to eat for a week. His mode of procuring money, also, laid him open to satire and pungent witticism, for there were no contrivances so mean or unjust that he disdained to practise them. He begged and borrowed "of abbots, friars, clerks, and men of low degree," and he exacted money from all classes of his subjects. He plundered the church, and the poor fishermen on the sea-coast were made to contribute to his necessities. As for the Jews, they were despoiled beyond all precedent, for Henry sold them as he would a farm, to his brother Richard.

Such was the state of public feeling A.D. 1236; a feeling which grew stronger and stronger. Henry was now twenty-nine years of age and still unmarried. Hitherto he had been unfortunate in love as well as in war. He had laid siege to several ladies' hearts, but had met with no success. At length, however, one yielded to his addresses. In this year he married Eleanor, daughter of the count of Provence; a union which led to the old story—an inundation of foreigners. Eleanor brought with her a numerous retinue, and hosts of foreigners followed to share in her good fortune. These were Gascons and Provencals: men equally as insolent and grasping as the Poictevins. At this time the people of the Continent were all of the same type; no matter from what part they came. Hence when they came to England they were all equally odious to the English nobility and the people. These Gascons and Provencals became especially obnoxious. And with good reason; for Henry lavished on them all his favours. The queen's maternal uncle, William of Savoy, bishop of Valence, was made chief minister; Boniface, another uncle, was made primate; and Peter, a third uncle, was invested with the earldom of Richmond, and received the lucrative wardship of the Earl Warrenne. Damsels were brought from Provence and married to young nobles, of whom Henry had the wardship, while rich heiresses were found for Gascons and Provencals, who had nothing to boast of but their fancied parentage. To add to the people's disgust, the four sons of the queen-mother, Isabella, by the count of La Marche, to whom she had been married shortly after the death of her husband, King John, were sent to England to be provided for by Henry. Riches and honours were showered upon them, and they were followed by adventurers from Guienne, who shared in Henry's prodigal favours.

For some years after Henry's marriage, the narrative of English History chiefly consists of the remonstrances of the English barons against the favours shown to this fresh herd of foreign favourites; their attempts to remove them from the king's presence and councils; and the arts employed by these foreigners to keep their ground. The king's lavish favours soon left him without either money or credit—he was a bankrupt monarch. In his extremity, he applied to parliament for aid, but over and over again they only voted him scanty supplies, and those only on the condition that he should dismiss his foreign favourites and redress their grievances. But no sooner was his wants supplied than his promises were wantonly broken. The barons then bound him by oath; and Henry took the oaths, but they were no more binding on his conscience than his promises. It was in vain that they reminded him of a clause in the Great Charter, which provided for the banishment of unjust favourites without any process of law: the infatuated monarch was persuaded by his favourites that the English laws were of no significance, and they were still retained in power.

The meanness of the character of Henry III. is well illustrated by incidents related by Matthew Paris at the birth of his first-born Edward, A.D. 1239. The streets of London, he says, were illuminated and bands of dancers made the night joyful with drum and tambourine. But Henry cared little for these barren rejoicings. He wanted money, and he sent out messengers into the city and country to ask for presents. When these messengers returned, if they were well loaded, the king smiled; but if the gifts were small, they were rejected with contempt. The chronicler adds that it was wittingly said, "God gave the child to the nation, but the king sold him to the people."

While thus unpopular, Henry was hurried into a second war with France by the queen-mother, Isabella. The chief cause of this war was offended vanity. The estates of Isabella's husband, the earl of Marche, lay in that part of Poitou which was subject to France, and Louis IX. having given that part of the country to the sovereignty of his brother Alphonso, commanded its barons to do their new lord homage. Isabella, however, persuaded her husband to shake off his allegiance to France rather than thus to demean himself, and she called in the aid of her son Henry in support of his rebellion. To enable him to undertake

this enterprise, Henry called upon his parliament for supplies of both men and money, but was flatly refused. By some means or other, however, money was obtained. It is said that he contrived to fill thirty hogsheads with silver for the purposes of his quixotic enterprise. Accompanied by his queen, his brother Richard, and three hundred knights, Henry sailed from Portsmouth, and made for the river Garonne. He was joined on the Continent by nearly twenty thousand men, for English gold never failed to raise an army there for any war, whether just or unjust. Most of those who rallied round his standard were paid mercenaries, but there were others who were anxious to render themselves independent of the crown of France. This expedition, however, was as unsuccessful and contemptible as that in which Henry had been previously engaged. He was defeated in a pitched battle on the banks of the river Charente, near the castle of Taillebourg; and again on the banks of the same river near the town of Saintes; and was finally compelled to flee across Saintonge to Blaye, leaving his military chest and the sacred vessels and ornaments of his moveable chapel royal in the hands of the victorious France. Louis IX. soon reduced that portion of Poitou which belonged to England, and compelled the earl of Marche to implore his mercy. Had Louis not been restrained by some scruples of conscience, he would have deprived the English monarch of his few remaining dominions on the Continent. Having purchased a truce for five years of the French king, Henry returned to England in September, A.D. 1243, and in order to conceal his shame, he commanded his military tenants to meet him at Portsmouth, and he was conducted by them to London with great pomp, as though he had been the victor, and not the vanquished.

The pride of the English was deeply mortified by this inglorious campaign. Henry was more unpopular than ever, and the pen of the satirist was fruitful in lampoons holding him up to ridicule. His parliament, also, became more refractory than it had ever been. When in the year 1244 he demanded more money, he was charged with extravagance; with frequent breaches of the Charter, and was plainly told that he was a monarch in whom his people could place no confidence. Parliament even demanded that the appointment of the chief justiciary, the chancellor, and other great officers of state should be placed in their hands. To this bold demand Henry demurred. He would consent to nothing more than another ratification of the Great Charter, which meant nothing, and hence parliament would only grant him twenty shillings on every knight's fee; and that grant was conceded more out of a spirit of gallantry than of care to the sovereign's wants, for it was granted for the marriage of his eldest daughter, Margaret, to the Scottish king, Alexander III.

It was now that Henry became more like a robber and a beggar than a king. He raised money by stretching his prerogative in respect to fines, benevolences, purveyances, and other branches of the ancient revenue. He plundered the Jews without mercy; and he begged from town to town, and castle to castle. No mendicant friar was ever more importunate for money than was King Henry. As for borrowing, there was no end to it; but what he borrowed he never paid. Hence it was that when he asked the abbot of Ramsay to lend him a hundred pounds, he naïvely replied, that "he gave but never lent;" and he went to the money-lenders to borrow the sum that "he might satisfy the wants of the beggar-king." But with all his plundering, begging, and borrowing, although he looked upon a meeting of parliament as a meeting of his enemies, in the year 1248, he was again compelled to call his barons together to ask for money: it was in vain. He was now told that he ought to blush to ask aid from a people whom he hated and shunned for the society of aliens, and was bitterly reproached for disparaging the English nobles, by forcing them into mean marriages with foreigners. All the numerous acts of his maladministration were on this occasion laid plainly before him, and Henry heard the complaints of his parliament patiently, and promised amendment. But the barons were no longer to be deceived: supplies were sternly refused.

Henry was now put to his wits' end for money wherewith to supply his personal wants, and the wants of his greedy favourites. In the hope of obtaining it, he said that he was now resolved to reconquer all his continental dominions; but as it was known that the French monarch Louis had departed for the east, and that Henry was under an engagement not to make war upon him during his crusade, that tale failed in its object. He next took the cross upon himself, and declared that he would make war upon the infidels in Palestine; but as it was certain that he had no such intention, and that he only wanted money to squander on his favourites, he was again unsuccessful. At the suggestion of his foreign advisers, Henry now turned to his plate and his jewels. "Who will buy them?" he asked. "The citizens of London," was the reply. So the Londoners purchased his plate and his jewels; Henry thus expressing himself when the purchase was completed:—"By my troth, if the treasures of Augustus were for sale, these citizens would be the purchasers. These clowns who assume the title of barons abound in all things, while we are wanting in the common necessaries of life." From this time Henry is said to have become more inimical and rapacious to the Londoners than ever. He made them smart for the purchase of his valuables in this very year. In those days when regular commercial intercourse between producers and consumers was imperfectly established, the fairs of England were of great importance to remote districts. Most large towns possessed charters for holding fairs once a year or more, and thither came traders and customers from all parts. But while they were a convenience, they were detrimental to the regular traders of the towns, inasmuch as during their continuance their shops were closed and their trade suspended. Large revenues were derived from these fairs by some of the prelates; and Henry now resolved to establish one for his profit, and at the same time to punish the Londoners who, he said, possessed a surfeit of riches. At the feast of St. Edward in October, he proclaimed that a fair should be held at Westminster for a fortnight, during which period no other should be held in the kingdom, and all traffic in London should cease, that the Westminster fair might be better

supplied with merchandise. The fair was held, and much toll was derived from the merchandise brought to it, but it proved a failure as regards profit to the traders. It was a time of wind and rain, and the tents were soaked through, so that the goods were spoilt, and the shivering traders "crouched mournfully in the swampy soil" by which the royal palace was then surrounded. Matthew Paris says that "those who were accustomed to sit at their meals in the midst of their families by the fireside knew not how to endure this state of want and discomfort." Nor was this the only revenge which Henry took upon the Londoners for being richer than himself. At Christmas he let loose his purveyors among them; on New-year's day, A.D. 1248, he made them offer the gifts of the season; and shortly after, he compelled them to pay him the sum of 2000*l.*, in violation of all law and right. From these exactions and caprices, a deadly hatred grew up between King Henry and the citizens of London. So alarming became their temper, that in the year 1250, he assembled them in Westminster Hall to entreat their forgiveness for his anger

WESTMINSTER HALL.

and malevolence, but it is probable that his contrition, whether real or pretended, was as damaging to him as his fines, imposed loans, and decrees for pulling down the posts and chains of the city whenever he imagined there would be a riot. It is quite clear that if Henry's contrition was sincere, it was only for the moment, and it is equally clear that the mutual hatred between him and the Londoners daily grew stronger. The feud was increased by the conduct of his retainers. Frequent riots occurred between them and the London apprentices. Thus, in the Lent of A.D. 1253, as the young men of the city were playing at their favourite game of Quintain, the king's pages and attendants insulted them, calling them "rustics and scurvy and soapy wretches," and entered the lists to break up the sport. But they got the worst of it on this occasion. The young Londoners hurled them from their horses, and sent them back in grief to Westminster, for which the citizens who favoured their apprentices had to pay a thousand marks. Queen Eleanor, also, increased the hatred between the Londoners and the Crown. In this year the king went to Gascony, and she was left "Lady Keeper of the Great Seal." There had been perpetual quarrels between Eleanor and the citizens about certain dues, called queen gold, which she claimed from all vessels navigating the Thames, and having now the power in her own hands, when the two sheriffs of London resisted the payment, she committed them to prison. This act was one which the citizens of London could never forgive, and when, shortly after, Eleanor was passing through London bridge in her barge, she was rudely assailed by mud and stones, and epithets never meant for ears polite. It may be that the Londoners at this period were too apt to take the law into their own hands, but their provocations were great, both from the king, the queen, and their proud retainers.

It has been mentioned that the king at this time was gone to Gascony. Before he went he once more met his parliament. The aspect of the kingdom was becoming serious; and in order to avert impending danger, Henry expressed his resolve to undertake a Crusade. It was ostensibly for that object he called a parliament. He only wanted, he said, a proper Christian aid, that he might go and recover the tomb of Christ from the infidel Turk. At first the barons, who had been so often duped, treated his demand with contempt; but finally they held out hopes of a liberal grant if he would consent to a fresh and most solemn confirmation of their liberties. Henry did consent, and then ensued a scene well calculated in those dark ages to render his promises inviolable. On the 3rd of May, A.D. 1253, the king was at Westminster Hall, surrounded by prelates, abbots, and barons. The bishops and abbots were dressed in their canonicals, and each held a taper in his hand. A taper was offered to the king, but he refused it on the ground that he was not a priest, a circumstance that gave rise to a suspicion that he would once more prove faithless. But the ceremony proceeded. The Great Charter and the Charter of Forests having been read aloud, and the king having promised to observe their conditions to the very letter, the archbishop of Canterbury pronounced sentence of excommunication against all who should, either directly or indirectly, violate the liberties and free customs contained in them, and as the primate ceased his denunciation the tapers were dashed to the ground, and as the lights went out in smoke, the prelates and abbots exclaimed with one voice, "May the sons of every one who incurs this sentence so stink and be extinguished in hell." On his own behalf, the king, upstanding, exclaimed, "So help me God! I will keep these charters inviolate as I am a man, as I am a Christian, and as I am a king, crowned and anointed." Henry laid his hand on his heart as he uttered these words, and his countenance denoted deep sincerity, but no sooner had he obtained a part of the grant—which was a tenth of all ecclesiastical revenues for three years, and a scutage of three shillings on every knight's fee—than he forewent his intended Crusade, setting sail, not for Palestine, but for Gascony.

The province of Gascony in France still belonged to the English crown, but several barons in that

province had raised the standard of rebellion against Henry. The king's brother-in-law, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, had been sent thither to quell the rebellion, which had been effected, but he had exercised such severity in his government that the people of Gascony were exasperated against him, and commissioners had been sent to England to accuse him of many acts of oppression. Henry took part with these commissioners, but when De Montfort was put on his trial, he was acquitted by his peers. He was, however, divested of his command in Gascony, and this, combined with a furious quarrel between him and the king, induced the Gascon barons again to rebel. The king of Castile was invited by them to take possession of their country, and on the pretence that Henry II. had made him a grant of the province he had entered it, and had wellnigh reduced the whole to his sway. Instead, therefore, of going to fight with the infidels in Palestine, on obtaining the grant from parliament, Henry went to measure swords with Alphonso of Castile in Gascony. On the whole, this expedition was more successful than those in which Henry had formerly engaged. He not only compelled Alphonso to renounce his pretensions to Gascony, but formed a friendly alliance with him—his son, Prince Edward, marrying Alphonso's daughter Eleanor. But these arrangements were for some time concealed from the English nation in the hope of obtaining more money from parliament under the pretence of carrying on the war. All the money Henry had taken with him was soon expended, and his troops were on the point of starving. Messengers were sent into England to cause provisions to be sent to him into Gascony, and parliament was called upon for more money; but "though a great quantity of grain and powdered flesh" was sent for the sustenance of the troops, the money he demanded was refused. Henry returned to England, A.D. 1255, penniless, for the partial re-establishment of his authority in the south of France was of no advantage to his exchequer. It was to his English subjects that he looked for money, and the mean expedients to which he resorted to obtain it, caused him to descend lower and lower in their estimation.

While in this bankrupt condition Henry embarked in a project which increased his embarrassments. Frederick II., king of Sicily, died A.D. 1250, excommunicated; and although he left a legitimate son—Conrad—Pope Innocent IV. claimed the right of giving away the crown. The kingdom of Sicily went a begging for a king among the princes of Europe. It was offered to several princes in succession, but no one would accept the golden offer. No doubt it was imagined that the crown would be beset with thorns, for Conrad was beloved by the Sicilian and Neapolitan people, and had an army to support his rights. Having hawked the Sicilian crown all over the Continent, Innocent turned his eyes towards England. It was offered to Richard, earl of Cornwall, whose great wealth might have bribed the Sicilian barons, and engaged mercenaries sufficient to enable him to keep it, at least for a season, but Richard wisely declined the offer, observing to those who offered it that they might as well say, "I make you a present of the moon; step up to the sky and take it down." Innocent now turned to the beggared and incapable King Henry. It was offered him for his second son, Prince Edmund, and at once joyfully accepted. He would march presently, he said, with a powerful army and take possession of the kingdom; and Innocent advanced him some money, and allowed him to borrow more on his security, to carry out the enterprise. But Henry did nothing more than give his son Edmund the empty title of "The King of Sicily," and incur a heavy debt to an exacting creditor. In the end, Pope Innocent brought a claim against him of more than 100,000*l*., which, it was alleged, had been borrowed chiefly from the merchants of Venice and Florence. Innocent was a creditor who could enforce payment by excommunication, interdict and dethronement; and just or unjust, Henry was compelled to acknowledge the debt, and promise to pay. But how was he to pay? That was the question! In the hope of obtaining the sum, Henry again met his parliament. His son, "the king of Sicily," was with him, dressed in the Apulian fashion, and Henry appealed to the sympathies of his barons. He remarked:—"You see, my faithful subjects, my son Edmund, whom the Lord, of his spontaneous favour, has called to the regal dignity. How evidently worthy he is of your favour, and how cruel would he be who would refuse him effectual aid." Then he pleaded his own cause. He had pledged himself, he said, under the penalty of losing his kingdom, to the payment of 140,000 marks, and he applied to them for aid in this his great necessity. Two crowns, therefore, in a measure, depended upon the answer which the barons were called upon to give to King Henry's demands. And what was that answer? They would only give him, they said, 52,000 marks; and those only on the condition that he would inviolably observe the charters of liberties. It was a pretty predicament for a king to be placed in; but as he had brought himself into it, the barons were resolved that he should get out of it how he could. His wits were put to the rack as to how he could preserve the crown to his head. He dared not touch the barons, for their hands were already on the hilts of their swords, and the slightest advance towards exaction on them would have been the signal for their drawing them from their scabbards. But in this case the creditor assisted the debtor out of his difficulties; although, unwittingly, he did it at his own cost. The goods of the Church had once been held sacred, but when a pope was to be paid, they were as much the king's as the clergy. Backed by Pope Innocent, King Henry levied contributions on the Churches both of England and Ireland. But these proceedings had a two-fold effect. They made the clergy as hostile to the king as the barons, and they not only lessened their reverence for the Pope, but shook his overgrown power—a power which, from the date of this subtle transaction, was doomed gradually to decline. How the measure was received by the clergy may be illustrated by two examples. When the bishop of Worcester was called upon to take up some of the Pope's bills, he said that he would rather die than comply with such a demand; and the bishop of London declared, when threatened with deprivation for refusing, that if they took away his mitre he

would supply its place with a helmet. Rustan, the Pope's legate, who made these demands, made some concessions, and the Pope's debt was finally liquidated; but this Sicilian speculation completed the long impending ruin of King Henry.

While Richard, earl of Cornwall, the king's brother, remained in England, there was but little fear of a widely extended insurrection. He was of a very different character from the king. His aim had been from his youth up to amass money—not to squander it away. He had amassed great wealth, and his riches, rather than his talents, procured him great influence with the people. He had often opposed his brother's illegal courses, and sided with the barons in their attempts to restrain those courses, but at the same time he had opposed the extreme measures which the barons had more than once contemplated. But Richard was now absent from the kingdom. His ambition had got the better of his prudence. He had refused the crown of Sicily, but he was not proof against a more dazzling temptation. The Germans had put up their empire for sale, and Richard was invited to become the purchaser, some of the electors having previously dignified him with the title of "The King of the Romans," which was conceived to be a stepping-stone to the imperial dignity. Richard left England, A.D. 1257, with an immense amount of gold and silver, the fruits of long hoarding, and having forty English gentlemen in his train; but when he arrived in Germany, he found that he had a powerful competitor for the imperial diadem in the person of Alphonso, king of Castile. In a word, Richard spent all the money he took with him to Germany, besides several remittances from England, and got nothing for it, except the empty title of "The King of the Romans."

It was while Richard was seeking the imperial crown in Germany that the storm so long impending burst over Henry's devoted head. When his falsehood, cowardice, fickleness, meanness, tyranny, and exactions, are remembered, it is marvellous that it had not overtaken him before. He lived in an atmosphere of scorn and hatred. The barons resisted him; the clergy frequently opposed him; and the burgesses and industrial classes, whose importance in the State was daily increasing, loathed him: yet, reckoning from the period when he came into possession of full regal power, he had occupied the throne, A.D. 1258, for thirty-six years, if not in actual peace, at least in comparative security. He had learned the art of ruling by pliancy. When opposed, he submitted; but it was only to obtain money, which, when obtained, he went on in his old course of extravagance and misrule. That course was now to be stopped by the power of the barons and the people. In the spring of this year there was a famine. The heavy rains of the previous summer had made the harvest late, and when the corn was ready to be garnered, the crops on the banks of the larger rivers had been swept away by floods. There was great distress in the land. Corn was brought from Germany, but not in sufficient quantities to prevent people dying from starvation. It is said that fifteen thousand people thus died in London alone; others perished in different parts of the country. There was want everywhere, and that want increased the general disaffection towards the Crown. Nor was this all. In the previous year there had been an incursion of the Welsh, and the borderlands had been laid waste by fire and sword. Yet in the midst of all this distress and general disaffection, Henry once more summoned a parliament to obtain supplies. The barons were called upon to meet on the 2nd of May at Westminster, but this time they came clad in armour. The supplies required by the infatuated monarch were for the payment of his debts, and for the prosecution of the conquest of Sicily, a project which, deluded by the Pope, he still entertained. As he entered the hall, there was a clatter of swords, and looking round in alarm, he asked if he was a prisoner. "Not so," exclaimed Roger Bigod, "but your foreign favourites and your own extravagance have involved this realm in great wretchedness: wherefore we demand that the power of government be entrusted and made over to a committee of prelates and barons, that the same may root up abuses and enact good laws." One of the king's half-brothers blustered and talked loudly, but Henry, intimidated by the determined air of the barons, gave an unconditional assent to their demands: on which they promised that if he proved sincere they would help him to pay his debts, and prosecute the claims of his son in Sicily. The parliament then dissolved, appointing an early day to meet at Oxford, to name the committee, and finally adjust the affairs of the State.

In the assembly at Westminster sat one of the most remarkable men of the times, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester. He was the son of that count de Montfort in France, who had been the bitter persecutor of the Albigenses. He became earl of Leicester, in right of his mother, Amicia, and he came to England, A.D. 1238, soon after which he married, with Henry's consent, but much against the will of the barons, his sister Eleanor, the countess dowager of Pembroke. It was not thought fitting that an English princess should be married to a foreign subject. But though a foreigner, Simon de Montfort became, from the date of his marriage, an Englishman in all his actions. No one in the kingdom more opposed foreign encroachments and foreign favourites. Hence he not only won the good-will of the barons, but he endeared himself to the English people. De Montfort was one of the first who discovered the worth and importance of the English burgesses and industrial classes, and to court their favour: hence his popularity. For his piety he also stood high in favour with the clergy; while his literary acquirements and his skill in war and politics increased his reputation among all classes of the community. But all this rendered him distasteful to Henry and his foreign favourites. He was banished the kingdom, but was afterwards entrusted with the government of Gascony, as recorded in a previous page. If he was severe in that government, he was faithful to the king; but, notwithstanding, Henry, on De Montfort's return from Gascony, although acquitted by his peers on charges laid against him, had the imprudence to call him a traitor. Naturally proud and passionate, De Montfort told the king he lied, and that but for his kingly rank he would make him repent the wrong he had done him. After that De Montfort withdrew for a season into

but he subsequently returned to England, s popularity increased daily; and of all the ho went armed to meet the king at West- Hall, he was the man most dreaded.

ljourned assembly met at Oxford on the 11th

By the old chroniclers it is called "The liament." But that designation is unjust, y's faithlessness and incapacity demanded the nary measures taken by this parliament to his evil government, and preserve the Great from invasions. In truth, few parliaments ibited more wisdom than this so-called "Mad nt" of Oxford. As a protection during their ions, the barons surrounded themselves with litary retainers; for it was anticipated that ht be attacked by the foreigners who were in 's pay. Opposition from the court was impracticable, and the barons proceeded o business. The twenty-four members of nittee were forthwith chosen, half by the half by the barons. Those chosen by Henry nephew Henry, son of Richard, "king of the " his half-brothers, Guy and William; the of London and Winchester; the earls of and Warenne; the abbots of Westminster Martin's, London; John Mansel, a friar; and Savoy, a relation of Queen Eleanor. The atives of the barons were the bishop of r; the earls Simon of Leicester, Richard of r, Humphrey of Hereford, and Roger of and the lords Roger Mortimer, John Fitz- Hugh Bigod, Richard de Gray, William Peter de Montfort, and Hugh Despencer. rl of Leicester, was placed at the head of this council; and the king first, and afterwards dward, took a solemn oath to maintain all its s. The parliament then proceeded to usiness. It was enacted that three sessions nent should be held every year, in February, l October; that four knights should be chosen tes of freeholders in each county to lay before ament all breaches of law and justice that ur, the county paying them for their services; w high sheriff should be annually elected by of freeholders in each county; that none of l wards should be entrusted to the care of s; that no new forests or warrens should be and that revenues of counties should not be m.

were the first regulations, commonly called isions of Oxford, which were made by this council. In them a regard to the public clearly discernible. No immediate benefits, were derived from them. As might have pected, the Provisions of Oxford were not by the king's party, and there was a dispo- set them aside. Prince Edward, and others l sworn to observe them, did so with great e; and Prince Henry openly protested that e of no force, till his father, Richard, king of ans, had consented to them. As for the action, they declared them to be both illegal ading to the king's majesty. Incensed at the n raised against them, De Montfort and his re led into the commission of acts which has laid them open to the charge of having interested and ambitious ends in view. They took possession of all the royal castles; turned out all the great officers of state, and of the king's household, to make room for themselves and their dependents; and not only engrossed the whole power, but a great part of the revenues of the crown. The king became a mere pageant of state, without the least shadow of authority, and the English constitution was changed from a monarchy to something very much like an oligarchy. Prince Edward and the king's half-brothers, and others who sided with them, opposed these measures, but in vain: they were obliged to submit. Henry's foreign favourites, against whom De Montfort denounced the most dreadful threatenings, on finding that the king could no longer protect them, fled out of the kingdom, as did also the king's half-brothers, and a host of their relations and retainers. With such a high hand did the barons exert their authority, that Richard, "king of the Romans," who came back to England A.D. 1259, was not allowed to land before he had solemnly engaged to take the oath of submission, and to comply with all the changes which had been thus effected.

Richard took that oath at St. Omer, but on his arrival in England he commenced organizing an opposition to the committee of government. That committee was in reality falling into disrepute when he set foot in England. Instead of finishing the work of reformation, in order that they might resign their commission, their time was spent in mutual quarrels. Two factions, in truth, existed among the members of the committee, one headed by the earl of Leicester, and the other by the earl of Gloucester. That of Gloucester obtained the ascendancy, and Leicester withdrew into France. The earl of Gloucester would now have become reconciled to the king, had it not been for Prince Edward, whose movements were so mysterious, that it gave rise to a suspicion of his having a design of seizing his father's crown. Be that as it may, when he found that Gloucester was desirous of becoming reconciled to the king, he declared for Leicester, who returned to England. For sometime the history of England consists of the intrigues of party, of quarrels and reconciliations between the Leicester and the Gloucester factions, and between the barons and the court. After the return of Leicester, Prince Edward, and Richard, king of the Romans, whose visit to England was chiefly for the purpose of replenishing his coffers, went over to the Continent, so that Henry had to contend with the factions unaided and alone. Taking advantage of the division which existed among the committee of government, in the spring of A.D. 1262, he formed a scheme for the recovery of his lost authority. He was provided with a dispensation from the Pope to violate the provisions of Oxford, and he had therefore no scruples about carrying out his scheme. His parliament met in April, at London, and suddenly appearing in the midst of his barons he reproached the committee of government with the breach of their promises to him, and the many abuses of their power; and then boldly declared that he would no longer pay any regard to the Provisions of Oxford, but would rule without them. He then

hastened to the Tower of London, whose governor he had gained over, seized a considerable treasure deposited there, and from behind its strong walls issued a proclamation, by which all the great officers, judges, and sheriffs, which had been nominated by the committee of government, were dismissed, and others, so far as the words of the proclamation had any force, put in their places. The measure adopted by Henry gave rise to the greatest confusion in the kingdom; for while some obeyed the officers and magistrates nominated by the king, others obeyed those appointed by the barons, while not a few obeyed neither the one nor the other, but lived as if all government had been dissolved.

Enraged at the conduct of Henry, the barons called out their vassals and marched upon the capital, the gates of which had been barred against them. To conquer the king the earls of Leicester and Gloucester agreed to bury their private quarrels and animosities in oblivion, binding themselves by the most solemn oaths to stand by one another, and to support the Provisions of Oxford with their lives and fortunes. A message was sent by them conjointly to the king, demanding that he should recall his late declaration and re-submit himself to those provisions, threatening that if he did not comply willingly, they would compel him to it by force of arms. Civil war was imminent, but as Prince Edward was in France, enjoying a tournament, both parties agreed to await his return before they commenced hostilities. Edward returned in haste, and with him came Richard, "king of the Romans." On his return, Prince Edward, instead of joining his father, took part with the barons. Henry had procured for him a dispensation from the Pope, but although he had taken the oaths at Oxford with unconcealed reluctance, he now refused to violate them. An appeal to the sword seemed inevitable, but it was averted for a season by the "king of the Romans." By his mediation an agreement was brought about on the following terms: that Henry should again submit to the Provisions of Oxford, and that the barons should modify some of its more obnoxious articles. The earl of Leicester, however, refused to sign this agreement; and vowing that he would never trust the faith of a perjured king, he once more retired into France.

By this pacification some degree of order and tranquillity was restored to the kingdom. But the faithlessness of Henry again provoked his barons to take up arms. In order to avoid fulfilling his part of the agreement, Henry went over to Bordeaux, under the pretence of settling some affairs in Guienne; and on his return, when the barons demanded the confirmation of the Provisions of Oxford, he treated them roughly, denouncing them as traitors, and threatening them with the severest punishments. At this time the earl of Gloucester was dead, and his son became for a time the bosom friend of Leicester. On the other hand, Prince Edward had espoused the cause of his father, and had called in a foreign guard. It would seem, indeed, that Henry's visit to Bordeaux was not only to avoid the confirmation of the Provisions of Oxford, but to make preparations for defence against the barons; and that his son, Edward, was not only privy to, but acting with him in his treacherous movements. But the barons were no united against both the king and the prince. I March, A.D. 1263, the young earl of Gloucester calle his retainers and confederates together at Oxford, a the earl of Leicester returned from France and to the command. There was, therefore, civil war aga in the land. Several royal towns and castles we captured, and all foreigners that fell in their w were put to death. Leicester marched in triumph London, where the mayor and common people declar for him. Henry had shut himself up in the tow and Prince Edward had fled to Windsor Castle. B again the "king of the Romans" stood in the breac He had spent all his hoarded treasures in search o the imperial diadem he never obtained, but he still ha influence both with the king and the barons. There was a second pacification by his mediation. On condition that all the king's castles should be delivered to the barons; that the Provisions of Oxford should be confirmed and observed; that all foreigners should be banished; and that the administration of affairs should be committed to whomsoever the barons pleased, the sword was again sheathed.

It must be confessed that some of the conditions imposed on Henry were arbitrary, and that a king so proverbially faithless as he was, could scarcely be expected long to observe them. In truth, Henry never made any concessions to his barons, without a mental reservation that he would break his compact on the first favourable opportunity. And so it was in this instance. There were alternate truces and hostilities throughout the year 1263. On one occasion we find Prince Edward besieged in the castle of Bristol by the burgesses of that city, and having contrived to escape from thence to Windsor Castle, he was there besieged by the barons. In a conference with the earl of Leicester he was taken prisoner, and compelled to purchase his liberty by the surrender of the castle. Then there was another pacification. On condition that the authority of the committee of government was to continue not only during the reign of Henry, but his successor, the sword was again encased in its scabbard. Peace and amity was sworn by the king and his barons in July; but in Oct they were again in arms, and the earl of Le narrowly escaped being taken prisoner by King H This new crisis appears to have been brought chiefly by the extraordinary stipulation of the cation of July. Prince Edward was enraged transaction. All his scruples, if he ever had about breaking the oath he had taken at O vanished into thin air. Denouncing the rebels, traitors, and usurpers, he declared war them and all their statutes. Hoping to avert horrors of a civil war, the Church now inter Some of the prelates induced the king and his to refer their quarrel for arbitration to Louis king of France. Louis, who was a conscientious justice-loving monarch, made his award in Februa A.D. 1264. He decided that the Great Charter was to be observed; but that the Provisions of Oxford, being destructive of the royal authority and subversive of the ancient constitution, should be annulled. All the royal castles should be given up, he said, and the sovereign should have full power of choosing his own

ıd officers, either from among foreigners or he pleased. No doubt Louis gave his ıll good faith, but he does not appear to the character of Henry into consideration. the barons. They well knew that if the hey had obtained by the Provisions of failed, those guaranteed by the national ıuld be, as they had before been, despised . The award of Louis, indeed, if acted l have placed matters in the same state as een when the barons drew the sword, and rejected it; asserting that it had been tained by the influence of Henry's sister, Louis.

was renewed with redoubled fury. Both pared for it with the greatest eagerness. ıthered his forces chiefly from the counties h, and the extreme west; and the barons idland counties, the south-east, the Cinque the city of London. The unholy contest ıtrated by a bloody massacre of the Jews; s murdered them under the pretence that red the barons, and the barons followed ple, alleging that they were in alliance king. Having thus wreaked their ven- hese poor, unoffending people, the royalists proceeded to destroy each other. At first s gained some advantages. Northampton by assault, and Simon de Montfort, one of sons, with the whole garrison were made

THE BARONS' HALL, ROCHESTER.

prisoners; and Leicester and Nottingham opened their gates to Prince Edward. But their fortune soon changed. The earl of Leicester had formed the siege of Rochester, in which Earl Warenne and other barons had taken shelter; and the king and prince, flushed with victory, hastened to their relief. Leicester, at their approach, raised the siege and retired with his army to London, and having been reinforced by fifteen thousand of its most zealous citizens, he again took the field. He found the royalists at Lewes. In their route the barons had sent a message to the king, assuring him that they desired to preserve the safety of his person, and to punish only the enemies of his kingdom, but they only received a defiant answer to their message, in which they were denounced as the enemies of the public welfare. It was on the 13th of May, A.D. 1264, that the royalists and barons came in sight of each other. Henry was lodged in the priory of Lewes, Prince Edward occupied the castle, and their forces lay in a hollow below the town. Leicester encamped on the Downs, about two miles from Lewes. It was on the 14th of May that Leicester led his forces against the royalists. The bishop of Chichester had given his army a general absolution, and an assurance that all who fell in battle would be welcomed in heaven as martyrs; and Leicester had decorated them with white crosses, which they wore on their breasts and backs, such as were worn by the army of God and the Church before the day of Runnymede. The royalists advanced to meet them. The king's army was in three divisions; that of the barons in four. Prince Edward commenced the battle by falling upon a body of the Londoners, who were quickly routed. Eager to revenge the insults the citizens of London had offered his mother, Edward followed them over the undulating ground four miles, slaying them in heaps; but while he was thus cutting down the hated Londoners the field was lost. Taking advantage of Edward's impetuosity, Leicester had thrown his remaining forces on the divisions of Henry and his brother Richard, and had taken them prisoners, together with John Comyn and Robert Bruce, who had brought their forces from beyond the borders to the aid of the king. And if Edward had slain three thousand Londoners in his headlong pursuit of them, he saw that hollow, from whence he had led his division, covered with the slain of his own party. He heard, also, that his father with many nobles were shut up in the priory at Lewes; and before he could recover himself to renew the conflict, he also was surrounded with a body of horse and taken prisoner. The victory was complete, but it is said to have cost the lives of five thousand Englishmen. On the following morning a treaty was entered into—known in history as the *Mise*, or agreement of Lewes—by which it was agreed that Edward and his cousin Henry should remain as hostages, and that the quarrel should be once more submitted to a peaceful arbitration. But though Henry was not confined within stonewalls, as his son and brother Richard appear to have been, he was really a prisoner in the hands of the barons. As for arbitration, none followed, for the referees refused the office, feeling assured that their award, like that of the king of France, would be rejected.

By the victory of Lewes, the administration fell into the hands of De Montfort, earl of Leicester, and Gilbert de Clare, the earl of Gloucester. Nominally the bishop of Chichester shared in the royal authority, but virtually he was a cipher in the state. The great man of the day was the earl of Leicester. Against him in particular the Pope levelled the ban of excommunication, although others, as his adherents, were included in that ban. But few at this period cared for that once terrible denunciation. Many of the native clergy, disgusted both with the Pope and the king, praised the earl from their pulpits: exalting him as the reformer of abuses, the saviour of his country, the father of the poor, and the avenger of the church. His name went through all the land as "Sir Simon the Righteous." Thus supported by the clergy and the people, Leicester compelled all those barons who held out for the king, to surrender their castles, and submit to the judgment of their peers, and they were exiled for short periods to Ireland. In effect Leicester was king; although Henry was still allowed to bear the title, and all acts of government was done in his name.

But in the midst of all his triumphs and popularity, the downfal of Leicester was at hand. He was the popular leader: adored by the people, and respected by the clergy. Monks and minstrels sounded his praise throughout the land. But like all statesmen of pre-eminent abilities, Leicester had his rivals, and this rivalry seems to have been excited by his own conduct. Success made him arrogant. Confident in his talents and popularity, he assumed undue superiority over his fellow-workers in the cause of freedom. This aroused not only their jealousy, but direct hostility. The earl of Gloucester especially finding himself eclipsed by his powerful associate, secretly conspired his ruin. At the commencement of the year 1265, Leicester issued writs in the king's name for a meeting of parliament, the first writs in which the parliament of England is distinctly recognised, for they were directed to the sheriffs, commanding them to elect and return two knights for each county, two citizens for each city, and two burgesses for each borough. Only eleven prelates and twenty-three peers were summoned on this occasion; whence Leicester stands charged by some historians with having summoned a democratic parliament for his own ambitious purposes. This famous parliament assembled on the 28th of January. It was professedly called to set Prince Edward at liberty, and a decree was promulgated to that effect, at the same time commanding that he should remain in "free custody" at Hereford. But although released from his durance in the strong castle of Dover, Edward was still a prisoner, guarded with the most jealous care by some of Leicester's adherents. But one of those adherents proved treacherous. Thomas de Clare, brother of the earl of Gloucester, was one of those who had the charge of the prince in his "free custody" at Hereford, and these brothers concerted a plan for setting him at liberty. In Whitsun-week, as Edward was riding with his attendants out in the country, he proposed a trial of horses. He wished to see which was the best mounted. The trial was made, and Edward's horse proved to be the fleetest, for he so far outstripped the others that it took him straight to the earl of Gloucester's camp, then at Ludlow. Gloucester had raised an army for the express purpose of opposing the high pretensions of the earl of Leicester, and Edward was warmly received by Gloucester and the barons who supported him. Having, indeed, taken an oath that he would respect the charters, govern according to law, and expel all foreigners, Gloucester placed the troops at Ludlow under his command.

The supporters of Edward soon increased in number. The Earl Warenne, who had fought for the king at Lewes, and had escaped that bloody field and fled to the Continent, landed in South Wales with a body of knights and archers; and Roger Mortimer with other barons came with their retainers and joined his forces. Leicester was at Hereford, having the king in his custody. From Hereford he marched to Worcester, from whence, under his control, Henry issued a proclamation declaring his son Edward and all his adherents traitors, and forbidding his subjects to render them any aid. But in vain was this proclamation issued—war was inevitable. Leicester wrote to his son Simon, who was in London, to bring troops from that city, and the Londoners ever faithful to his cause, again marched to battle. But Prince Edward again triumphed over the hated Londoners. He met them at Kenilworth, and defeated them with great slaughter. Simon de Montfort escaped and shut himself up in his father's castle at Kenilworth. In the hope of meeting his son's forces, Leicester advanced to Evesham, his army encamping in a tongue of land encircled by the Avon, between that town and Twyford. Shut up in that narrow and bounded field of action, he waited his son's arrival. He waited in vain. On the 4th of August, as he looked towards the direction of Kenilworth, he saw his son's banners approaching, but he was not with them; they were the banners which Prince Edward had taken, and they were displayed in order to deceive his antagonist. The joy, therefore, of Leicester on seeing them approach, was momentary. He discovered the deception when it was too late to retreat, and he prepared for action. He had a presentiment of the issue of the battle, but he scorned to flee before his enemies. Exclaiming, "The Lord have mercy on our souls, for I see our bodies are Prince Edward's," he marshalled his troops and advanced to conquer or die. He attempted to force the road to Kenilworth, but Edward's army stopped the way. He then formed a solid circle on the summit of a hill where he was attacked in front and rear and on both flanks. Fierce were the charges, and as fiercely were they several times repulsed. King Henry was in the midst of Leicester's forces, encased in armour, and in one of these charges he was dismounted, and would have been slain had he not cried out that he was "Henry of Winchester." He was carried in safety out of the *melée*. But there was no escape for the gallant Leicester. His horse was killed under him, and he fought bravely on foot; no quarter was given. His son Henry was slain before his eyes, and the bravest and best of his troops fell thick and fast around him. There was a fierce cry for the blood of the great earl, and at length it was mingled with that of his followers. He died with his sword in his hand. The slaughter



THE FIRST PARLIAMENT.

as indiscriminate. Some historians have extolled he clemency of the royalists for not having shed any lood on the scaffold, but when that awful day's work as done there was but little blood left to be shed by he hands of the executioner. All the barons and knights of Leicester's army were despatched, and the meaner sort perished by thousands. The vale of Evesham was red with the blood of the slain, for there as no escape from the royalist horsemen. The spirit by which the royalists were actuated towards the fallen earl was seen in their treatment of his lifeless remains, for they mutilated his body in the most barbarous manner, and then presented it as an acceptable spectacle to the wife of the lord Roger Mortimer, one of Leicester's most deadly enemies.

The character of the earl of Leicester is not easily defined. By his enemies he was abhorred as a devil; by his friends considered a saint and guardian angel. That he was the dread of Henry is put on record in the clearest light. On one occasion, after the meeting of the "Mad Parliament" at Oxford, the king was overtaken by a thunder-storm as he was rowing in his pleasure barge on the Thames. He landed in the garden of the bishop of Durham for safety, and Leicester, who was in the palace, went forth to greet him. "What do you fear, Sir?" asked the earl; "the storm has passed over." "I fear lightning and thunder beyond measure," replied Henry; "but by God's head, I fear you more than all the lightning and thunder in the world." Henry had cause to fear him, for his inflexible love of justice and freedom could ill brook the king's deceit and tyranny. It was not against the king's person he warred, but his maladministration. There was no man of his age who so sternly and consistently sought to establish the liberties of his country on a sure basis. He might have been ambitious, but withal he was a true patriot. There is no instance on record, even in the plenitude of his power, wherein he was not sincerely desirous of promoting the interests of the English people. It was mainly for that welfare that he carried on the contest against a faithless king, and a rapacious court, for which he fought, and bled, and died. Hence it is no wonder that at his death the people mourned; secretly, indeed, for fear of the king's displeasure, but sincerely. According to Holinshed, it was conceived by the people that in being thus slain in defence of the liberties of the realm and performance of his oath, he died a martyr. And this feeling was deep rooted in the public mind. In the next age, says Holinshed, the united holiness of his life, and the miracles ascribed him after his death, increased the popular reverence for his character. Men even complained that the church would not canonize him, for he was then honoured as a saint and martyr. Hymns were sung his honour, and the name given to him in life—Sir Simon the Righteous!"—long dwelt upon the ps of posterity. One of the poems occasioned by the ath of Leicester, breathes a religious spirit akin to war ballads written in the time of Charles the st. Its last stanza, as translated, reads thus:—

"Brave martyr'd chief, no more our grief
For thee or thine shall flow:—
Among the blest in heaven ye rest
From all your toils below:
But for the few the gallant crew,
Who here in bonds remain,
Christ condescend their woes to end,
And break the tyrant's chain.
On Evesham's plain is Montfort slain;
Well skilled he was to guide;
Where streams his gore shall all deplore
Fair England's flower and pride."

The posthumous honours paid to the memory of the great earl in prose and verse certainly go far to vindicate him from the sinister motives he is suspected by some to have entertained.

The death of Leicester did not put an end to civil contests. The spirit of liberty was not trampled out in the bloody field of Evesham: it lived as vigorously as ever. After that victory was won, Henry resumed the sceptre and went to Warwick. He was joined there by Richard, "king of the Romans," and other prisoners taken at Lewes who now recovered their liberty. In the next month, on "The Feast of the Translation of St. Edward," a parliament was held at Winchester. On this occasion it was seen that, though the barons had fought for Henry, they were still resolved that he should observe the charters. But while the barons still exhibited a love for constitutional freedom, led away by their animosities, they sanctioned severe sentences against the family and partisans of the late earl, the great estates of his family and of his partisans being universally confiscated. The citizens of London were punished by the deprivation of their charter, which was a cherished time-honoured privilege. But these proceedings only provoked resistance to the government. Simon de Montfort long defied the king's armies in the isles of Ely and Axholm; the Cinque Ports refused to submit to the king's authority; the castle of Kenilworth held out till the garrison was compelled to surrender through famine; and one Adam Gourdon, a warlike baron, maintained himself bravely in the forests of Hampshire. Prince Edward was occupied two years in reducing these various opponents, and much blood was shed on both sides during his operations. So determined was the opposition, that before the castle of Kenilworth surrendered, A.D. 1266, a parliament was held in that town in which more moderate counsels prevailed. A committee was appointed of twelve bishops and barons to compound with those barons who were in arms; and some of them who had been deprived of their estates were, on making submission, restored to favour. But this did not restore peace. On the contrary, it gave rise to new dissensions and troubles. The chief cause of the overthrow of the baronical oligarchy was the rivalry of the earls of Leicester and Gloucester. Alleging that even the *Dictum de Kenilworth*—as the award of the bishops and barons was called—was too harsh, and that the king was seeking to infringe the Provisions of Oxford, the earl of Gloucester armed himself in their defence. While Henry was engaged in an expedition against Ely, and Prince Edward was reducing some of the disinherited barons in the north, Gloucester marched with an army to London, where he was received with open arms by the citizens. Gloucester published a manifesto, declaring that he had taken up arms to procure more moderate terms for those whose estates had been confiscated, and to compel both the king and his

son to observe their promises of preserving the liberties of England. Losing heart, however, at the approach of the united forces of Henry and Edward towards London, Gloucester opened negotiations and submitted on condition of receiving full pardon, while the Londoners made their peace by the payment of 25,000 marks. But this determined aspect of the people, combined with the exhortations of the Pope, produced milder measures, which had a greater effect in restoring tranquillity than the sword. One instance of clemency especially had more influence in subduing opposition than all the executions and severities which had followed the battle of Evesham. In a battle fought

THE BELL TOWER, EVESHAM.

in a wood near Alton, in Hampshire, Prince Edward engaged the warlike baron, Adam Gourdon, in a hand-to-hand fight; and although the baron is represented to have been a skilful warrior, and a person of great strength, Edward took him prisoner. Charmed with the bravery of Gourdon, the prince, instead of despatching him, not only saved his life, but granted him his liberty, a favour which he returned by the most zealous and devoted services. But the great act of pacification took place at Marlborough, A.D. 1267. At that time the isle of Ely had surrendered, chiefly owing to the defection of the earl of Gloucester, and to the valour and abilities of Prince Edward; and yet in a parliament, held when opposition was on the wane, some of the most valuable provisions of the earl of Leicester were adopted, and other laws favourable to the liberties and welfare of the kingdom were enacted. By these measures all resistance was disarmed; and the civil wars and dissensions which had so long distracted the country, ceased. Most of the disinherited barons, on making their submission, had their estates restored to them; but the De Montforts were proscribed and excepted from all acts of grace. Simon and Guy fled to the Continent, where they led a wandering life, and where, as will be seen, they took a terrible revenge for the fate of their father, by murdering Henry, son of "the king of the Romans," and nephew of the king. But though the land was now at peace there were still many freebooters in some of the wooded districts; and some interpreters of song and legend conceive that Robin Hood and his famous companions were a section of the disinherited barons at this period, a conception for which there is no authority beyond imagination.

Prince Edward had by these civil wars established his fame as a warrior. He had fought and conquered his future Christian subjects, and as soon as tranquillity was restored, he took the cross to fight against the Pagans in Palestine. The king of France, Louis IX., had already departed for the Holy Land, and the Pope's legate, Ottobini, who had been active in his endeavours to restore peace in England, exhorted him to follow the French monarch's example. It would appear, indeed, that one of the chief motives of the Pope's interference between King Henry and his subjects, was for the purpose of promoting this, as it proved to be, last crusade. Edward embarked with his wife Eleanor, his cousin Henry, and numerous knights, in July, A.D. 1270, having first judiciously obtained a new charter, with the restoration of their liberties, for the citizens of London, and the removal of the king's ban from a few nobles hitherto unpardoned. It is doubtful whether Edward was induced either to assume the cross from a love of glory or from religious enthusiasm. Lingard suggests that the Crusades opened a field for the exertions of turbulent spirits, who might have been still dangerous at home, and it is certain that some of the barons who had recently been in arms against the king, and whose fidelity was of a suspicious character—as the ambitious earl of Gloucester—were amongst the number who took the cross at this period. Policy, therefore, would seem to have been mingled with Prince Edward's religious enthusiasm. The expedition proved a sure means of ridding the kingdom of the disaffected, for many of those knights and barons who embarked in it never returned to their native land. The king of France did not reach Palestine, for he died of dysentery on the unhealthy coast of Tunis. As for Henry, son of "the king of the Romans," his fate was more tragical than the death of Louis, and of those Crusaders who died on the field of battle. He reached Palestine, but being despatched back to England on a secret mission, he took the road through Italy, and as he was at prayers in a church at Viterbo he was murdered by his two cousins, Simon and Guy de Montfort, who after mutilating his remains, as those of their father had been in the vale of Evesham, mounted their horses and escaped unmolested. Their father, the old "king of the Romans," who was still pleasing himself with the idea that the imperial diadem would yet adorn his brow, did not long survive the shock; he died December, A.D. 2711.

Meanwhile Prince Edward was warring in Palestine. He relieved Acre, which was besieged by the sultan of Babylon; gained some battles, and captured Nazareth; but here his triumphs ended. The Moslems exclaimed, "By Allah, another Cœur de Lion has appeared from England;" and they had recourse to treachery, to stop the second English lion's progress. After the capture of Nazareth he returned to Acre, where his wife gave birth to a daughter, Joanna, and

where he narrowly escaped death by the dagger of an assassin. The emir of Jaffa was in correspondence with him, having gained his confidence by professing a desire to become a Christian. A messenger arrived with a letter from the emir, and being admitted into Edward's presence, as Edward was reading the letter, he suddenly aimed a blow at his heart with a dagger. He missed his deadly aim, and the prince, grappling with his assailant, flung him on the ground and slew him, but not before he had himself received a dangerous wound. The dagger was poisoned, and contemporary annalists record that, as the poison spread in the wounds, they were only cured with great difficulty and the application of various remedies. A Spanish story relates that Eleanor sucked the poison from the wounds at the risk of her own life, but although such a remedy might have been effectual, there does not appear to be any good authority for such a romantic tale. After this, having made an agreement with the sultan that the Christians should not be molested for ten years, Edward returned homewards; and while in Italy he received intelligence of the death of his father, who expired at Westminster on the 16th of November, A.D. 1272, having lived sixty-eight years, fifty-six of which he had been king—at least in name.

The inglorious character of this long reign is chiefly to be attributed to Henry's want of prudence and principle. He was desirous of peace, but his want of good faith towards the barons led to cruel internal contests, pernicious to the welfare of his kingdom. Yet, notwithstanding his misrule during his reign, England improved and acquired strength: commerce was extended, domestic industry stimulated, and civilization advanced both among citizens and peasantry. But this progress cannot be ascribed to Henry's talents as a ruler; rather it seems to have originated in his mismanagement and careless profusion, for the demands he made on the country for money led to increased commerce; and thus unforeseen good arose out of evil. His great error appears to have been that he uniformly sought to obtain the ends he had in view by the winding ways of treachery and deceit. His lack of sincerity in making, and of fidelity in observing, his engagements became proverbial. Every page of his history testifies to his insincerity and want of truth. And yet his piety is extolled by the monkish historians of his times! But of what value is piety without truth and honour? If he was pious, however, it was only in a superstitious sense. He was a devout worshipper of relics; especially those of his favourite saint, Edward the Confessor, which he had removed to the abbey church of St. Peter's, and placed in a shrine of gold, adorned with precious stones. It is related that on one occasion he summoned all the great and learned men of his realm to hear of a sacred benefit conferred upon England in the shape of a phial, containing a small quantity of blood shed by the Redeemer on Mount Calvary; and that he afterwards carried it through a deep miry road with the greatest care, and deposited it in Westminster Abbey. These were, no doubt, considered virtues in his age, but they were virtues better fitted for the cloisters than the throne. His religion was manifestly gross superstition, and not that rational faith which purifies the heart. And yet, though Henry was devoutly superstitious, and a useful and liberal son to his spiritual father, the Pope, he was not altogether priest-ridden. He could rebuke the pride and grasping exactions of the clergy. It is related that on one occasion, when four prelates complained that he disregarded their rights, by filling up vacant benefices himself, he replied: "It is true I have been somewhat faulty in this particular. I obtruded you, my lord of Canterbury, upon your see: I was obliged to employ both menaces and entreaties, my lord of Winchester, to get you elected, when you should rather have been at school: my proceedings were very irregular and violent, my lords of Salisbury and Carlisle, when I raised you from the lowest stations to your present dignities: it will become you, therefore, to set the example of reformation, by resigning your benefices, and you may then try and enter again in a more regular and canonical manner." Wise words are often put into the lips of monarchs by flatterers; but if Henry did thus rebuke his discontented prelates, then he was not the simple fool he is so often represented; and they afford a proof that his misrule was not for lack of understanding, but of prudence and principle.

During the long reign of Henry, the Welsh princes or chieftains made frequent attempts to extricate themselves from the superiority of the crown of England over them and their country, but in vain. Every attempt ended in fresh submissions. In the late civil wars, Llewellyn, prince of Wales, had warmly espoused the cause of Leicester and the barons, and finally shared in the consequences of their defeat. After the surrender of the isle of Ely, the royal army marched into Wales, which obliged Llewellyn to renew his homage and fealty to Edward, and to pay the sum of twenty-five thousand marks, as a punishment for his hostility.

Between England and Scotland there was an almost uninterrupted peace of half-a-century. Alexander II., king of Scotland, had been induced, by the prospect of obtaining possession of the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, to enter into the confederacy with prince Louis of France, but as soon as that prospect vanished, by the defeat of the confederates at Lincoln, he made his peace with Henry, which was cemented by Alexander's marriage with the English monarch's eldest sister, Joan. A friendly intercourse was established between the two royal families, Alexander and his queen being frequently entertained as visitors in the English court. At the same time there were still several subjects of dispute between the two monarchs, which on more than one occasion threatened a rupture of friendship. On the one hand, Henry sometimes endeavoured to obtain homage from the king of Scotland, such as had been given to Richard I.; and on the other, Alexander still sought to obtain possession of the three northern counties. This dispute was finally settled, A.D. 1237, through the mediation of the Pope's legate; Alexander consenting to accept of certain lands in Northumberland and Cumberland in full of all demands. In the next year, Joan, queen of Scotland, died, leaving no issue; and in the year following, Alexander married a French lady, Mary,

daughter of Ingelram de Coucé. By these events the great bond of union between the two countries was removed, and although the friendship which had hitherto subsisted was not immediately dissolved, yet it gradually declined, and national jealousies again revived. In the year 1244 war was imminent between the two monarchs, for both parties had made preparations, but through the mediation of Richard, earl of Cornwall, and some other English barons, it was hapily prevented, Alexander engaging to live in amity with England, and not to assist her enemies, unless provoked by wrong. Alexander, who, according to Matthew Paris, "was beloved by the people of England as well as by his own subjects," died A.D. 1249, and was succeeded by his only son, of the same name, then only eight years of age.

Alexander III. was knighted and crowned by the bishop of St. Andrew's, at Scone, on the 13th of July; five days only after the death of his father. In infancy he had been betrothed to Margaret, eldest daughter of King Henry, and on the 26th of December, A.D. 1251, their nuptials were celebrated with great pomp at York, both then being about ten years of age. On that occasion the young king did homage to Henry for his possessions in England, but wisely refused to pay him homage for his kingdom, as Henry, taking advantage of his youth and inexperience, ungenerously required. During the minority of Alexander, Scotland was a scene of various revolutions. There were two parties, one composed of the Comyns and their friends, and the other of the rest of the nobility and their followers. The Comyn party had possession of the persons of the young king and queen, who were lodged in Edinburgh castle, which gave them an advantage over their rivals. It would appear that Alexander and his queen Margaret were held in great restraint by the regents, Robert de Ros and John de Baliol, and that Henry was induced, by the complaints of his daughter, to embrace the interests of the opponents of the Comyns. The rivals of the Comyn party having taken the castle of Edinburgh by surprise, and set the young king and queen at liberty, Henry advanced to the borders of Scotland, in August, A.D. 1255, with an army to support them. There was no fighting on this occasion, for Henry was enabled, while at Roxburgh, to displace the Comyns and their friends from all power in the kingdom, and to commit the administration of the government to fifteen of the chiefs of the opposite party, without drawing the sword. Henry charged his military tenants in the five northern counties to assist the king of Scotland in any emergency with all their forces, and for a time his kingdom enjoyed tranquillity. But this peace was not of long duration; it was disturbed by a quarrel about the consecration of a bishop. In opposition to the injunction of the chiefs in power, the bishop of Glasgow, in the interests of the Comyns, consecrated Gamelin, late chancellor, bishop of St. Andrew's. Gamelin was outlawed, and his revenues seized, on which he repaired to Rome, and the Pope espoused his cause so warmly, that he excommunicated the chiefs in power. Taking advantage of this, the Comyns and their party complained that the king and the government were in the hands of persons excommunicated. They flew to arms, and seized the king and queen at Kinross. Having formed an alliance with Llewellyn, prince of Wales, then—A.D. 1257—at war with England, they marched to the borders, carrying the young king with them. Henry again interfered. He raised an army in the north, but again there was no fighting, for by his mediation he formed a coalition of parties: there was now a regency of ten persons, four of each party, and the queen dowager and her second husband, John de Brienne. Such was the government of Scotland till A.D. 1260, when Alexander, having arrived at full age, assumed the reigns of government, and no more is heard of the strife of parties. It was well there was union, for in the year 1623, Haco, king of Norway, with a fleet of one hundred and sixty ships, sailed towards Scotland, with the evident intention of recovering such of the western isles as had formerly belonged to his crown. He made himself master of Arran and Bute, and afterwards landed his army on the coast of Cunningham; but he was here met by Alexander, who had collected his forces to resist the invaders, who were defeated with great slaughter. On the day after the battle the Norwegian fleet, in which those who had escaped the slaughter had taken refuge, was scattered by a storm, but Haco reached the Orkneys, where he died. This defeat of the Norwegians was followed by the reduction of almost all the western isles, and the submission of Magnus, king or chief of the Isle of Man, who agreed to hold his country in fief of Alexander, and to furnish him with ten galleys when demanded, in proof of his subjection to the Scottish crown. On the death of his father Haco, however, Magnus became king of Norway, and he yielded all his rights, A.D. 1266, to the western isles, and the Isle of Man to the crown of Scotland, for the sum of four thousand marks, to be paid in four years, and a hundred marks annually, retaining only the Orkney and the Shetland islands to the crown of Norway. These were the chief incidents in the reign of Alexander III., after he had assumed full sovereignty, during the reign of Henry III. As before recorded, he had assisted his father-in-law in his conflicts with his barons, many of the bravest of his subjects falling in the battle of Lewes, and John Comyn and Robert Bruce, two of his most renowned warriors, being taken prisoners, who, however, were afterwards set at liberty. Beyond this, the reign of Alexander III. affords few materials for history during the life of his father-in-law; but it may be mentioned that his queen, Margaret, was delivered of a son, Alexander, A.D. 1263, and of another son, David, A.D. 1270.

SECTION II.

EDWARD I., SURNAMED LONGSHANKS.

Henry III. was buried at Westminster, on the 20th of November, A.D. 1272. "On the same day," says Matthew of Westminster, "when the king had been buried, as is the custom of kings to be buried, Gilbert, earl of Warenne, and all the clergy and laity, proceeded without delay to the great altar of the church aforesaid, and there swore fealty to Edward, the eldest son of the late king, though they were wholly

ignorant whether he was alive, for he was in distant countries beyond the sea, warring against the adversaries of Christ. And after this, the nobles of the kingdom assembled in like manner at the New Temple of London. And having a new seal made, they appointed faithful ministers and guardians to protect faithfully the treasures of the king, and the peace of the kingdom." Walter de Merton was appointed chancellor; and the archbishop of York, and the earls of Cornwall and Gloucester, were chosen regents of the kingdom, a choice which was solemnly confirmed by a parliament in January, A.D. 1273.

On hearing of the death of his father, Edward is said to have expressed much sorrow; but he was in no great haste to enter upon his duties as king of England. He spent his time between Rome, Paris, and Guienne till the year 1274. He went to Paris to pay homage to Philip of France for the territories which he held of that crown. While at Guienne, he received a challenge from the count of Chalons to meet him lance to lance at a tournament. Rumours of bad faith on the part of the challenger were abroad, but as a true knight, Edward considered himself bound in honour to enter the lists with the count. The Pope told him by letter that he was not bound to answer the challenge, but his knightly spirit prevailed over the royal prudence. Edward was attended by a thousand champions: the count's attendants numbered nearly two thousand. On their meeting, the image of war was soon converted into a real battle. A sanguinary conflict took place, and in the *mêlée* many were killed. Both knights and foot-soldiers took part in the fray. The English cross-bow men drove the French infantry from the field, and then mixing with the French horse, overthrew many of the knights by stabbing their horses or cutting the saddle girths. Edward himself fought with the count, and unhorsed him. He fell from his saddle with a fearful shock, and begged for quarter, but Edward would not release him till he had given up his sword to a common soldier, a disgrace in the opinion of that age of chivalry to which no true knight would have submitted. The English were the victors in this "little war of Chalons." Many French knights were compelled to ransom their persons, arms, and horses, while great numbers of the French foot-soldiers were slain: but, says Matthew of Westminster, "as they were persons of low degree, very little notice was taken of their death."

At length Edward turned his thoughts towards England. Having suppressed an insurrection in Gascony, and settled some commercial disputes with the earl of Flanders—disputes which had stopped all trade between the English and the Flemish—he embarked for his native country. He landed at Dover on the 3rd of August, A.D. 1274, and on the 19th, he and his queen were crowned at Westminster. There were great rejoicings and much feasting on that occasion. While on the Continent, Edward had sent orders what was to be prepared for his coronation feast, and if those orders were obeyed, there must have been an abundance of viands. There was to be 380 head of cattle, 430 sheep, 450 pigs, 18 wild boars, 278 flitches of bacon, and 19,660 capons and fowls. Here was, indeed, if not a "dainty," yet an abundant dish "to set before the king." And it really does appear that it was set before him and his subjects. Besides the two halls at Westminster, and the two halls at Windsor, there were others erected in which tables were fixed in the ground, at which all who came, princes, and nobles, the rich and the poor, were feasted for fifteen days. Kitchens were built beside the halls, and leaden caldrons placed outside the kitchens for additional cooking; while a vast temporary stable was erected in St. Margaret's churchyard for the accommodation of the guests' horses. It was a magnificent entertainment, and no doubt, as the guests partook of the three hundred barrels of wine purchased for the occasion, there were loud and continuous cries, as they raised their horn cups, of "Long live King Edward!"

But with all this lavish feasting and drinking—for the conduits, it is said, "ran plentifully with white wine and red, that each one might drink his fill"—the government was poor and embarrassed. Who then was to pay for the feast? The king. But from whom was he to obtain the money? His loyal people—for they were loyal, and proud of the valour and fame of Edward—were now well protected from arbitrary spoliation by the Great Charter; and as he had invited them to the feast, he would not be so mean as to exact money from them to pay for the entertainment. But there was one class of his subjects from whom Edward could and did extort money—the unhappy Jews. For, in spite of all pretexts, the poverty and embarrassment of the government was the exciting cause of the deep animosity King Edward exhibited towards that oppressed people throughout the whole of his reign. There were no protecting laws for them: on the contrary, they were left naked to oppression and wrong. Crimes were laid to their charge of which they were wholly innocent. Thus they were accused of clipping and adulterating the coinage; and although the practice had for many years been so common, that clipped money might have been found upon every one in the kingdom, yet if any was found in the possession of the Jews, they were severely punished. Hundreds of them, of both sexes, were hung throughout the country, and the houses and entire property of all who suffered were forfeited to the Crown. Edward's animosity seemed to increase with his years, his religious antipathies serving as a convenient sanction for his rapacity. As a zealous Crusader, he hated all unbelievers, and he committed upon the Jews in England the same wrongs perpetrated by the Mohammedans on the Christians in Palestine. Thus he put a capitation upon them and compelled them to wear a distinctive and odious badge upon their dress: in both which customs he imitated the infidel Saracens. And in this crusade against the Jews he was aided by the Pope, who, in the year 1286, addressed a bull to the archbishop of Canterbury, forbidding the association of Christians and Jews. But in spite of persecutions exercised year by year towards that unhappy people, they still continued to flourish and accumulate wealth. Like their ancestors in Egypt, the more they were oppressed the more they multiplied and grew. They were a numerous and powerful body; and by reason of their commercial activity, like those of the present day,

great capitalists. There was no making them poor; it was no use shearing them of their golden fleece; it would grow again. Their prosperity made them the more hated, and at length the persecution of them reached its climax. In the year 1290, there went forth a proclamation that the whole community of Jews was to quit the kingdom. Their migration was to commence on the 27th of July, and from that time to All Saints day, about sixteen thousand of this despised race bade farewell to the land in which most of them had been born, and where they had homes and local affections, to seek refuge in some other land, if it could be found, where they would be free from that fiery persecution which the Pope, the king, and the people, professed to carry on for the love of Christ and his religion. They were allowed to carry away with them as much of their ready money as would pay the expenses of their voyage, but King Edward, the royal Crusader against all Jews, Turks, and Infidels, seized the great mass of their treasures, together with their houses, lands, bonds, and tallies for his own use. But although they had the king's pass, not all of them left the kingdom in safety. The mariners of London and the Cinque Ports thought it no sin to murder and rob those on whom King Edward had set his ban. Holinshed relates an incident which well illustrates the dangers to which they were exposed during the period of their migration. He says:—"Some of the richest of the Jews being shipped in a mighty tall ship, which they had hired, the master mariner bethought him of a wile, and caused his men to cast anchor, and so rode at the same till the ship, by ebbing of the stream, remained on the dry sands. The master then enticed the Jews to walk out with him for recreation; and at length when the Jews were on the sands, and he understood the tide to be coming in, he got him back to the ship whither he was drawn by a rope. The Jews made not so much haste because they were not aware of the danger, but when they saw how the matter stood, they cried to the master for help. He, however, told them they ought to cry rather upon Moses, by whose guidance their fathers had passed through the Red Sea. They cried, indeed, but no succour appeared, and so they were swallowed up by the water." Some few mariners were executed for the plunder and murder of the exiles; for, says Hume, the king was resolved to be the sole plunderer in his dominions.

While Edward was thus persecuting the Jews, he was seeking the welfare of his Christian subjects. In May, A.D. 1275, many good laws were enacted, which are known in history as "The Statutes of Westminster." Measures were also taken to repress the disorders which had been engendered by his father's misrule, and to enforce the administration of justice. But the reformations he brought about were not the work of the first years of his reign. Time is required for the eradication of great evils. If the judges were corrupt in Henry's reign, not less so were they in King Edward's. Thus we find that in the year 1289, all the judges of the land were indicted for bribery, and only two out of the whole number were acquitted. But it may be that Edward mingled mercenary motives with his justice. He had just returned from a costly sojourn on the Continent o nearly three years, in great want of money; and tha circumstance probably had much to do with the con demnation of the judges as corrupt ministers of th law, for it is recorded that he extracted from them on hundred thousand marks as fines for their delinquen cies. It was shortly after this that the Jews were ex pelled the kingdom, and their estates confiscated; an it would seem on a charge that taking advantage of th venality of the judges, they had exacted a higher ra of interest for moneys lent than heretofore, thoug in reality, it was to obtain their estates and treasure These were two plans adopted by Edward, after L expensive sojourn in France, to replenish his e hausted treasury. In another plan he tried he w not so successful. Had he not stopped in time, inde the spirit which it aroused might have proved fa to the peace of the kingdom and the stability of *his* throne. Under pretence that the royal domains had been encroached upon, commissioners were appointed to examine the titles by which some of the barons held their estates, in order to recover that which had been lost to the crown. Among those who were called upon to show his title deeds was earl Warenne, one of those barons who had been a firm supporter of the throne. Indignant at such a demand, the proud earl drew his sword, and exclaimed:—"By this instrument I hold my lands, and by the same I intend to defend them. Our ancestors coming into this realm with William the Bastard acquired their possessions by their good swords. William did not make a conquest alone, or for himself solely: our ancestors were helpers and participators with him." After this, Edward prudently stopped all further inquiries; but during the investigation some of the less powerful barons, whose written deeds and grants from the Crown had, during the various convulsions from the date of the Conquest, been lost or destroyed, and who could not show such indisputable title-deeds as the warlike earl Warenne, had their estates and manors taken from them, and could only redeem them by replenishing Edward's exhausted treasury with their gold.

Meanwhile Edward had been engaged in war. His ruling passion was the desire of conquest. But unlike his ancestors and successors, his ambition did not lead him to seek extended territory on the Continent. His energies were devoted to the accomplishment of a great home scheme, that of incorporating Britain into one kingdom, subject to the same sovereign and the same laws. His first object was the subjugation of Wales, which at this time was laid open to aggression by the conduct of its Prince Llewellyn. As before seen, Llewellyn had aided the barons against King Henry, and had suffered for his interference. He had promised fealty to Edward before he went on his crusade, but he was in no haste to pay him homage on his return. He had suffered much hardship at the hands of Henry during his youthful captivity, and he suspected the intentions of Edward towards him. And as the stanch friend of the family of De Montfort, to whose daughter he had pledged his hand in the days of their prosperity, he had grounds for suspecting those intentions. Hence, when Edward summoned him as a vassal of

h crown to take part in his coronation, he attend without a safe conduct. He was moned to meet Edward at Chester, and to attend a parliament at Westminster, f which occasions he refused to appear. rred A.D. 1275, in which year Llewellyn e young Eleanora by proxy, still clinging or and exiled orphan in the days of her

In the next year Eleanora sailed with r Almeric to join her affianced husband, as intercepted in her passage from France and detained as a prisoner in the English ewellyn demanded the release of his bride, nand was rejected; he offered a ransom for er brother, but Edward was inexorable. was again summoned to attend a parlia- to pay homage to Edward, but he again the summons. He answered it by com- inst the good faith of the English monarch, ood reason; for Edward not only kept his stody, but in direct opposition to the terms treaty, he had given shelter and encourage- he enemies of Llewellyn, and had been the Welsh chief with bribes and promises. wonder, therefore, that the Welsh prince come to England unless his bride was and hostages were put into his hands for f his person. But Edward did not at this im in England. His plans were matured. lected an army; his parliament had pro- e sentence of forfeiture against Llewellyn ; and to aid him in his enterprise the ll the willing tool of ambitious and power- , had issued the ban of excommunication n.

n the spring of A.D. 1277 that Edward led nto Wales. Crossing the Dee, his forces into the heart of the country, his fleet g along the coast by blockading every port g off the supplies which Llewellyn had on from the Isle of Anglesey. Driven into ins of Snowdon as winter approached, the the Welsh prince became desperate. He th, obliged to throw himself on his enemy's

The terms dictated were harsh in the Llewellyn was to pay 50,000*l.*; to cede of his principality as far as the river o do homage, and deliver hostages. He in the Isle of Anglesey, but that also, if thout issue, was to revert to the English l while he held it he was to pay an annual 1000 marks. To these hard terms Llewel- ted; but Edward afterwards remitted the 00*l.* and the annual tribute, but probably on that his creditor was too poor to pay. as the Welsh prince repaired to West- d there did homage to Edward for his sovereignty; and in the next year, A.D. ora was given up to him, and they were Worcester in the presence of Edward and

conquest of Wales was not yet finally con-

The seeds of future war were sown while was at the court of Westminster. The is who attended him with their retinues, which, according to their custom, were large, were quartered in "Islington and the neighbouring villages." Carte, the historian, says:—"These places did not afford milk enough for such numerous trains; they liked neither wine nor the ale of London, and though plentifully entertained, were much displeased at a new manner of living which did not suit their taste, nor perhaps their constitutions. They were still more offended at the crowds of people that flocked about them when they stirred abroad, staring at them as if they had been monsters, and laughing at their uncouth garb and appearance. They were so enraged on this occasion that they engaged privately in an association to rebel on the first opportunity, and resolved rather to die in their own country than ever come again to London as subjects to be held in such derision; and when they returned home, they communicated their resentments to their compatriots, who made it the common cause of their country."

Other causes besides the derision of the Londoners combined to drive the Welsh into rebellion. The very treaties that Edward imposed on this occasion were sufficient to produce future revolt. David, the brother of Llewellyn, had fought for Edward, and was rewarded by him with an English wife and an English barony for his services. When, however, David once more stood among his native mountains, he forgot Edward's favours. He reflected that his folly had not only brought ruin on his country, but had excluded him from all hope of succeeding to the principality. The English conquerors also fanned the smouldering flames of rebellion by their treatment of the conquered people. Many of the English settled in the country between Cheshire and the river Conway, and treated those around them with the

CONWAY CASTLE.

greatest insolence. Not only did they hold the Welsh in contempt, but they invaded their demesnes, cutting down the wood on those which were reserved for their use by treaty. Both prince and people were exasperated by the conduct of the English, and all resolved to make another brave effort to recover the ancient freedom and independence of their country.

[illegible] Edward [illegible] Wales, [illegible] Llewellyn [illegible] Snowdon. [illegible] Edward [illegible] Menai [illegible] Anglesey. [illegible] Llewellyn [illegible] Edward [illegible] Menai [illegible] Llewellyn [illegible] Edward [illegible] Llewellyn [illegible] Edward [illegible] Llewellyn [illegible] Edward



EDWARD I. PRESENTING HIS SON TO THE WELSH.

be regarded as an ultimate blessing to that
iful portion of our island. It put a stop to those
its of blood, and those scenes of desolation which
he pages of history; and made way for the in-
ction of the English laws, learning, arts, and
es, into its mountains and valleys.

ere was now a pause in the career of Edward's
ion. In the interval of peace he spent three
on the Continent, during which period he was
employed in prosecuting claims which he had
tain territories in France, as heir to his mother,
or of Provence, and in settling a dispute which
een long and bloody, between the kings of
e and Arragon, and the house of Anjou, respect-
e island of Sicily. Edward returned to England
289; after which, as before recorded, he prose-
the judges for bribery, persecuted and exiled
ws, and called upon the tenants of the crown to
ce their title-deeds. After this he prosecuted
sign of making Britain "one and indivisible."

year, A.D. 1290, saw Edward on his march to
nd. There had been for many years peace and
ny between the two kingdoms. United by the
blood, the two royal families had maintained a
nt amicable intercourse, broken only by slight
es. The coin of each kingdom had been current
other, and the merchants of each country had
d the most perfect freedom in their transactions.
peace and harmony was now coming to a close;
long series of cruel and destructive wars, which
ht many calamities on both kingdoms, were
to succeed. Before peace and harmony were
restored, torrents of the best blood of both
ies were destined to be shed like water on the
d.

this time the crown of Scotland was disputed
veral competitors. Alexander III. had died
Edward was on the Continent, and there were
ss than thirteen competitors for the vacant
. Three only, however, out of this number had
that required consideration; namely, John
, Robert Bruce, and John Hastings. It was for
tensible purpose of deciding between these rival
nts, that Edward advanced to the borders; he
called upon to act as umpire to settle the dis-
Several conferences took place between him
e Scottish barons, and a commission was ap-
d to investigate the matter and make a report
g Edward.

Scottish barons made an unfortunate choice of
pire to decide between the rival claimants for
vacant throne; for Edward wanted the throne
tland for himself. In recent years he had taken
o secure it in his family. Alexander III. died
286, by a fall from his horse at Kinghorn, with-
aving any male issue, and without any descend-
xcept Margaret, born of Eric, king of Norway,
Margaret, daughter of the deceased Scottish
ch. This princess, commonly called the Maid
rway, though a female, and an infant, and a
ner, was the lawful heir of the kingdom; and
randfather had obtained her recognition as his
sor before his death. At his demise, Margaret
cknowledged queen of Scotland, and a regency
ppointed to conduct the affairs of her kingdom
during her absence. The regents were the bishops of St. Andrew and Glasgow, the earls of Fife and Buchan, and James Steward of Scotland, who entered peaceably on the administration. Under the protection of Edward her uncle, and Eric her father, Margaret seemed firmly seated on the throne. For some time the regents acted with wisdom and unanimity, but the earl of Buchan dying, and the earl of Fife being murdered, the remaining regents commenced a quarrel, which gave rise to great confusion in the kingdom. Apprehensive that the interests of his daughter were at stake, Eric applied to her uncle, Edward, for his assistance and protection. That was an incident favourable to the project Edward had long contemplated. He had formed a scheme for uniting the two British kingdoms by the marriage of his eldest son, Edward, with the young queen Margaret, and had privately procured a dispensation from the Pope for that purpose. Eric readily gave his assent to this union, and the amity which had of late prevailed between England and Scotland favoured the project. The states of Scotland gave their consent to Edward's proposals, and even agreed that their young sovereign should be educated in the court of Edward. This agreement was made in a Scottish parliament, held at Brigham, near Kelso, A.D. 1290. Such an union was universally deemed favourable to the happiness and grandeur of both kingdoms; but in settling the conditions, the parliament of Scotland took every precaution to preserve the independence of their country, and to guard against every danger that might arise from such a close alliance with a powerful and ambitious monarch as Edward was known to be. It was agreed that the Scots should enjoy all their ancient laws, liberties, and customs; that in case Edward and Margaret should die without issue, the kingdom of Scotland should revert free, absolute, and independent to the next heir; that in case Edward should die before Margaret without issue by her, the body of Margaret should be remitted to Scotland free and independent; that the military tenants of the crown should never be obliged to go out of Scotland in order to do homage to the sovereign of the united kingdoms, nor the chapters of cathedral, collegiate, or conventual churches, in order to make elections; that the parliament summoned for Scottish affairs should always be held within the bounds of that kingdom; that the kingdom of Scotland should have its chancellor, officers of state, courts of justice, &c., as before; that a new great seal should be made and kept by the chancellor, with the ordinary arms of Scotland, and the name of none but Queen Margaret engraved upon it; that all papers and records belonging to the crown and kingdom should be lodged in a secure place within the bounds of the country, under the seals of the nobility; that no duties, taxes, or levies of men should be raised but such as had been usual; and that Edward should bind himself under the penalty of one hundred thousand marks, payable to the Pope, for the use of the holy wars, to religiously observe all these articles. No better precautions could have been taken than these, to preserve the freedom and independence of Scotland; and it does not appear that Edward raised any objections to the articles. On the contrary, he gave his willing assent to them; although in

The universal patriotism was inflamed by superstition. An old prophecy was revived which set forth that the ancient race of the Britons should, when English money became circular, recover its traditional supremacy in the island, and that the prince of Wales should be crowned king in London.

It was in the spring of A.D. 1282 that the Welsh flew to arms. Their first attempts were crowned with success. On the night of Palm Sunday, amid a howling storm, Prince David surprised the strong castle of Hawarden belonging to the justiciary Roger Clifford—who, according to the Welsh annals, was a cruel tyrant—and all its inmates were put to the sword except Clifford, who was conveyed a prisoner to the heights of Snowdon. Llewellyn now besieged the castles of Flint and Rhuddlan; and the mountain chiefs assembling, their dependants poured down upon the lowlands, and drove the English from their settlements in the marches. Edward expressed surprise on hearing of this revolt, but he was not ill-pleased with it, as it gave him an opportunity of making his conquest final and absolute. He sent for foreign aid from Gascony, and summoned his barons and military tenants to meet him at Worcester. He took the command of his forces about Midsummer, and marched from Worcester into North Wales, his fleet again acting upon the coast, and directing its efforts to reduce the isle of Anglesey. Unable to meet him in the open field, Llewellyn again retired into the fastnesses of Snowdon. All the passes were seized, and Edward once more resolved to reduce the Welsh by famine. Attempts were made to penetrate this last bulwark of Welsh independence, for Edward had under his command mercenaries—Basques from the Pyrenees—who were accustomed to mountains far more rugged than those of Wales. These Basques did penetrate into Snowdon, but Llewellyn was not driven from his mountain stronghold. Had he remained there, he might have prolonged the warfare, although there was little hope of a successful resistance. The contest was unequal; the Welsh were a brave people, and struggled nobly for their independence, but Edward was continually receiving reinforcements from across the Dee and from the sea-coasts; and numbers finally prevailed. On more than one occasion, however, Edward met with reverses and defeats. In the course of the struggle possession was obtained of the isle of Anglesey, but in passing from that island to the main, a detachment of his forces suffered a severe loss. In crossing the strait upon a bridge of boats wide enough for forty horsemen to go over a breast, an alarm was given that the Welsh were descending from their ambush in the hills, and in a precipitate retreat many knights and several hundred foot soldiers perished; some by the sword, others by drowning in the turbid waters. Edward was subsequently defeated in another battle, and obliged to take refuge in one of his castles. The successes of Llewellyn, however, lured him on to his downfal. Leaving the passes of Snowdon to be defended by his brother David, he descended into the open country, and he fell, on the 11th of December, in a battle fought near Bualth, together with two thousand of his followers. His head was cut off and sent to London, where it was placed on the walls of the Tower of London, crowned with an ivy mockery of that prediction which had been exciting causes of his drawing the sword, a lated. After the death of this brave Welsh principal chiefs made their submission. Pr held out for six months longer in a des fare, but he was at length betrayed and tak to Shrewsbury, where he was arraigned peers as a traitor, and where in the Hig that city he was ignominiously executed. ner of the death of this last of the ancient of Wales is a stain on King Edward's mem was drawn to the gallows by a horse as a the king who had made him a knight hanged as the murderer of the knights had taken in the castle of Hawarden; were burned because he had consummated on Palm Sunday, thereby profaning the s Christ's passion; and he was quartered, an dispersed through the country, because he ferent places, compassed the death of hi king." The forms of this execution wer in cases of treason for several ages, till c swept the practice away in common with ot outrages of human feeling.

Edward remained more than a year spending the greater part of his time in di country into hundreds and shires, and resto and tranquillity. There is a tradition whic Gray has perpetuated in a noble ode, that Wales he commanded a general slaughter of bards. But this tradition rests upon ver authority. That their utter destruction effected is certain, for from this date to t Elizabeth their productions, still extant, are No doubt the Welsh bards had by their strains greatly assisted to excite the valour o mountaineers, and it can scarcely be sup Edward held them in favour; but that he so foul an act after his absolute conqu country demands a doubt. It is expressl indeed, that after the death of Llewellyn, proclamation offering peace to all the inhab assuring them that they should continue t their lands, liberties, and privileges, as the before. As, however, the bards of Wales w souled race, some of them may have been subsequent attempts to incite the people resistance, and have suffered death as a co On the whole, however, it is clear that Edw the purification of Wales by mild and judi sures. He lightened the taxes they had b tomed to pay; gave charters and privileges communities; and although he introduce forced the laws of England, he neverthele some of the ancient usages of the country. Wales the queen bore him a son, who was castle of Cærnarvon, and Edward availed this event to present the infant to the peo prince. It was from this period that the el the sovereigns of England has borne the tit Prince of Wales." However, therefore, the feelings of posterity may sympathise wit and noble people, who had for eight centu gled for independence, the final subjugatio



EDWARD I. PRESENTING HIS SON TO THE WELSH.

must be regarded as an ultimate blessing to that beautiful portion of our island. It put a stop to those torrents of blood, and those scenes of desolation which mar the pages of history; and made way for the introduction of the English laws, learning, arts, and sciences, into its mountains and valleys.

There was now a pause in the career of Edward's ambition. In the interval of peace he spent three years on the Continent, during which period he was chiefly employed in prosecuting claims which he had to certain territories in France, as heir to his mother, Eleanor of Provence, and in settling a dispute which had been long and bloody, between the kings of France and Arragon, and the house of Anjou, respecting the island of Sicily. Edward returned to England A.D. 1289; after which, as before recorded, he prosecuted the judges for bribery, persecuted and exiled the Jews, and called upon the tenants of the crown to produce their title-deeds. After this he prosecuted his design of making Britain "one and indivisible."

The year, A.D. 1290, saw Edward on his march to Scotland. There had been for many years peace and harmony between the two kingdoms. United by the ties of blood, the two royal families had maintained a constant amicable intercourse, broken only by slight disputes. The coin of each kingdom had been current in the other, and the merchants of each country had enjoyed the most perfect freedom in their transactions. That peace and harmony was now coming to a close; and a long series of cruel and destructive wars, which brought many calamities on both kingdoms, were about to succeed. Before peace and harmony were again restored, torrents of the best blood of both countries were destined to be shed like water on the ground.

At this time the crown of Scotland was disputed by several competitors. Alexander III. had died while Edward was on the Continent, and there were no less than thirteen competitors for the vacant throne. Three only, however, out of this number had claims that required consideration; namely, John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and John Hastings. It was for the ostensible purpose of deciding between these rival claimants, that Edward advanced to the borders; he being called upon to act as umpire to settle the dispute. Several conferences took place between him and the Scottish barons, and a commission was appointed to investigate the matter and make a report to King Edward.

The Scottish barons made an unfortunate choice of an umpire to decide between the rival claimants for their vacant throne; for Edward wanted the throne of Scotland for himself. In recent years he had taken steps to secure it in his family. Alexander III. died A.D. 1286, by a fall from his horse at Kinghorn, without leaving any male issue, and without any descendant except Margaret, born of Eric, king of Norway, and Margaret, daughter of the deceased Scottish monarch. This princess, commonly called the Maid of Norway, though a female, and an infant, and a foreigner, was the lawful heir of the kingdom; and her grandfather had obtained her recognition as his successor before his death. At his demise, Margaret was acknowledged queen of Scotland, and a regency was appointed to conduct the affairs of her kingdom during her absence. The regents were the bishops of St. Andrew and Glasgow, the earls of Fife and Buchan, and James Steward of Scotland, who entered peaceably on the administration. Under the protection of Edward her uncle, and Eric her father, Margaret seemed firmly seated on the throne. For some time the regents acted with wisdom and unanimity, but the earl of Buchan dying, and the earl of Fife being murdered, the remaining regents commenced a quarrel, which gave rise to great confusion in the kingdom. Apprehensive that the interests of his daughter were at stake, Eric applied to her uncle, Edward, for his assistance and protection. That was an incident favourable to the project Edward had long contemplated. He had formed a scheme for uniting the two British kingdoms by the marriage of his eldest son, Edward, with the young queen Margaret, and had privately procured a dispensation from the Pope for that purpose. Eric readily gave his assent to this union, and the amity which had of late prevailed between England and Scotland favoured the project. The states of Scotland gave their consent to Edward's proposals, and even agreed that their young sovereign should be educated in the court of Edward. This agreement was made in a Scottish parliament, held at Brigham, near Kelso, A.D. 1290. Such an union was universally deemed favourable to the happiness and grandeur of both kingdoms; but in settling the conditions, the parliament of Scotland took every precaution to preserve the independence of their country, and to guard against every danger that might arise from such a close alliance with a powerful and ambitious monarch as Edward was known to be. It was agreed that the Scots should enjoy all their ancient laws, liberties, and customs; that in case Edward and Margaret should die without issue, the kingdom of Scotland should revert free, absolute, and independent to the next heir; that in case Edward should die before Margaret without issue by her, the body of Margaret should be remitted to Scotland free and independent; that the military tenants of the crown should never be obliged to go out of Scotland in order to do homage to the sovereign of the united kingdoms, nor the chapters of cathedral, collegiate, or conventual churches, in order to make elections; that the parliament summoned for Scottish affairs should always be held within the bounds of that kingdom; that the kingdom of Scotland should have its chancellor, officers of state, courts of justice, &c., as before; that a new great seal should be made and kept by the chancellor, with the ordinary arms of Scotland, and the name of none but Queen Margaret engraved upon it; that all papers and records belonging to the crown and kingdom should be lodged in a secure place within the bounds of the country, under the seals of the nobility; that no duties, taxes, or levies of men should be raised but such as had been usual; and that Edward should bind himself under the penalty of one hundred thousand marks, payable to the Pope, for the use of the holy wars, to religiously observe all these articles. No better precautions could have been taken than these, to preserve the freedom and independence of Scotland; and it does not appear that Edward raised any objections to the articles. On the contrary, he gave his willing assent to them; although in

giving it to the clause which concerned the future independency of the Scottish crown, he made this reservation: "with a saving of his former rights." But this reserve gave no alarm to the Scottish nobility, and for two reasons: first, because those rights had not for a long time been urged, and had occasioned no disturbance; and second, because by the union of Prince Edward and the young Queen Margaret, there was a prospect of seeing them entirely absorbed in the rights of their sovereignty.

The two nations heartily concurred in this intended union of the two crowns. There were rejoicings on both sides the borders, for there seemed to be a bright future for the two kingdoms. Commissioners were forthwith sent from Scotland to bring the fair Maid of Norway to her dominions. But all the pleasing hopes of peace and union which existed among the people of both countries were destined to be dashed to the ground. Fair winds brought the child queen as far as the Orkney Isles, but on landing there she sickened and died. It would be difficult to find in history the death of any one person attended with more fatal consequences than that of Queen Margaret. For a time, the regency formerly established maintained order, but the succession of the crown became an object of dispute, and the regent could not expect that a controversy of this nature, in which reason and argument usually gives way to the sword, would be peaceably settled by them, or even by the states of the kingdom; especially as some of the claimants to the throne were powerful. As before related, there were thirteen competitors for the vacant throne; but the contest lay chiefly between three, John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and John Hastings. By the death of Margaret of Norway, the posterity of William, king of Scotland, who had been taken prisoner by Henry II., became extinct; and the right to the crown devolved on the issue of his brother David, earl of Huntingdon, whose male line being also extinct left the succession open to the posterity of his daughters. David had three daughters; Margaret, married to Alan, lord of Galloway; Isabella, who was united to Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale; and Adama, who espoused Henry, lord Hastings. Margaret, the eldest of the sisters, left one daughter, who married John Baliol, whose son it was who stood forward as a competitor for the crown. Isabella, the second daughter, bore a son, Robert Bruce, who also insisted on his claim. Adama, the third daughter, left a son, John Hastings, who claimed a third of the kingdom; contending that, like other inheritances, it was divisible among the three daughters of his grandfather David. Baliol and Bruce united against Hastings in maintaining that the kingdom was indivisible; but each of them, supported by plausible reasons, asserted the preference of his own title. Baliol was sprung from the elder branch, but Bruce was one degree nearer the common stock. As Hume observes, if the principle of representation was regarded, Baliol had the better claim; but if propinquity, then Bruce was entitled to the preference. Opinions were divided on this question; some of the nobles taking part on one side and some on the other, the people following their respective leaders. The two claimants themselves had great power and numerous retainers, and they eagerly engaged in preparations for war, to decide the dispute by the sword. To avoid this, however, the regent, the states, and even the competitors themselves, agreed to refer this great controversy to Edward, king of England. He had always professed the greatest respect and even affection for the Scotch nation; he had acquitted himself with great honour as an umpire between the competitors for the crown of Sicily; and he had power sufficient to put his sentence into execution. Who then was so fitting an umpire on this momentous occasion as King Edward? In this all were agreed, so the bishop of St. Andrews, one of the regents, and a particular friend of the English monarch, was sent to his court to entreat him to take upon himself the office of umpire between the competitors, an office which he accepted with pleasure, but which he managed with the most consummate policy for his own interests.

The temptation offered Edward on this occasion, to carry out his long cherished designs, was too strong to resist. It was a favourable opportunity for him to revive the worn-out claim of a feudal superiority over the kingdom of Scotland. Had the Scottish barons suspected that he would ever have revived such a claim, they would never have chosen him for an umpire. But it was too late: Edward saw his chance, and it was eagerly embraced. It was a divided kingdom. There were two rivals with their hands on their swords: surely one or the other would pay him the homage he desired, and whichever would should be king, at least in name. Such appears from Edward's after actions to have been his inmost thoughts, as he entered upon his office. As arbitrator, he summoned the states of Scotland, and the rivals, Baliol and Bruce, to meet him at Norham, a small town on the south banks of the Tweed, a few miles from Berwick. This was an infraction of the late treaty; but to remove any scruples they might have in coming within the borders of England, he made a declaration that it should not be made a precedent. Once assembled, Edward commenced his project of obtaining a feudal superiority over Scotland. The states were told, in an opening speech made by Roger Brabazon, chief justiciary of England, that King Edward had come to determine the great cause concerning the crown of Scotland, in virtue of his right of superiority and direct dominion over that kingdom, and before anything could be done, it was necessary that this right should be immediately recognised, and solemnly acknowledged by the states. In support of his pretensions to this superiority, a paper containing arguments, carefully collected, was read to the assembly: arguments "more like the pleadings of a chicaning attorney than that of a great king." They were chiefly drawn from old chronicles, many of which were unfairly quoted, enumerating the various defeats which the Scots had received from the English, and the disadvantageous treaties which they had made with them; and recapitulating all the homages which had been paid by the kings of Scotland to the kings of England. It was insinuated that these homages had been paid for the kingdom of Scotland; though all the pages of history testify to the fact that they were rendered for lands, which the Scottish kings had possessed, or claimed, in England. Edward was not even

ashamed of calling in the aid of legend in support of his pretensions. The legendary stories of Brute and his sons, and of Athelstan's cutting a yard deep with his sword into a rock, near Dunbar, by the assistance of St. John of Beverly, were quoted as proofs of the superiority of the kings of England over those of Scotland. Particular stress was laid on the homage performed by William the Lion, when prisoner, to Henry II., for the whole kingdom of Scotland, but no mention was made of the renunciation of that homage and superiority, granted by Richard I., to the same King William. The whole paper was made up of fallacies, which the states could easily have refuted, but they do not appear to have argued the matter with Edward. They demurred making the acknowledgment, and asked for a day to consider, which was given; and when that day arrived they asked for further time, in order that the absent prelates and barons might be consulted; and with considerable difficulty they obtained a delay of three weeks. The king of England and the states were to meet again on the 2nd of June, when their decision was to be given. Meanwhile, Edward employed all his arts to strengthen his party in Scotland—for he had some who favoured his pretensions—and by threats and promises he gained over several new partisans. The day for the decision of the states at length arrived. The meeting took place in a plain opposite the castle of Norham, where Edward then lay: his representative being the bishop of Bath and Wells, chancellor of England. Some of the Scottish barons urged that the question of the superiority of Scotland could not be determined till a king had been chosen, inasmuch as his honour and interest was chiefly concerned in the matter. But Edward would not proceed to the question as to whom the crown of Scotland was to be given till he was acknowledged lord-paramount; and the rivals for that crown, afraid of offending him, expressed their willingness to acknowledge his superiority, and by their influence and example brought the rest of the states to acknowledge the same, or to remain silent. But even this was not sufficient to induce Edward to proceed in the business. He compelled the competitors to give him letters-patent under their hands and seals, owning to his superiority, and promising to submit to his decision; and when these were given, in order that he might have a kingdom to bestow, he demanded and obtained possession of all the royal castles and places of strength in Scotland.

It was now that a commission was appointed to examine into the question at issue: whether the more remote by one degree, Baliol—who was a grandson of Margaret, eldest daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon—or the nearer by one degree, Bruce—a son of David's second daughter, had the best title. Baliol and Bruce each named forty commissioners, and Edward added twenty-four to that number. They sat at Berwick, and the knotty question occupied three whole months before the commissioners came to any conclusion. At the end of that time, November 17th, 1292, Edward appeared in the great hall of the castle of Berwick to give his award. In the presence of all the prelates, barons, and great men of both kingdoms, he adjudged John Baliol to be the rightful heir to the throne of Scotland. In reality, however, he adjudged the kingdom of Scotland to be his own, for in giving his award he added this significant clause; "that he reserved his right of property to the crown as claimable hereafter." On this vague condition Baliol consented to hold the kingdom of Scotland; doing homage for it with all due solemnity to king Edward; after which all the royal castles and strong places were put into his possession.

Baliol soon found that a dependent crown was of no great value, and that he was only king in name. That he might not forget on whom he was dependent, immediately after his coronation, Edward recalled him into England, and made him renew his homage and fealty at Newcastle. Nor was this the sum of his humiliation. Edward was constantly heaping indignities on his head. In a little more than a year he received no less than six citations to appear before the king of England in his parliament, to answer the complaints of several private persons, on matters of slight importance. John attended Edward in his parliament at Westminster, in the autumn of A.D. 1295. He had borne his rough usage with equanimity up to this period; but when one of the complaints against him came to be tried in this parliament, he was refused the privilege of answering by attorney, and compelled to stand at the bar like a common delinquent. His spirit could not brook the insult, and he was resolved to embrace the first favourable opportunity of throwing off such an intolerable yoke of vassalage.

That opportunity was soon presented. It was still an age of violence, robberies, and disorders—the feeble execution of the laws giving license to all orders of men. The barons and their retainers were prone to rapine and revenge by land; and the merchants and mariners to piratical habits by sea. Then there was a false honour everywhere existing throughout society, which induced men on any provocation, however slight, to seek redress by immediate retaliation upon the aggressor. Out of one such slight provocations, at this date, resulted momentous consequences. There was a quarrel between the crews of an English and French ship about a spring of fresh water near Bayonne. Both crews came to the spring at the same time for the refreshing beverage, and a dispute arose as to which should slake their thirst and obtain supplies for their respective ships first. There was water enough for all, but that was of no moment. There was a fight for precedence, and a French sailor was killed in the fray. This gave rise to a national quarrel. A fleet of two hundred Norman ships sailed southwards, and seized all the English ships they met with in their passage, hanging the crews and making prizes of the cargoes. The Cinque Ports now took up the quarrel. A fleet of sixty ships, all well-manned, was sent in search of the Norman fleet. They met and fought, and the English were the victors. The greatest part of the Norman fleet was captured, and as no quarter was given, the carnage was frightful. The French said they lost fifteen thousand men—but this number was no doubt greatly exaggerated. At the commencement of this quarrel, the two monarchs of England and France, who were both engaged in more im-

portant matters, refrained from meddling in this quarrel between the mariners. This last affair, however, was so serious that Philip the Fair demanded reparation. Negotiations followed, but to no purpose. Edward sent the bishop of London to the court of France with several proposals, but they were rejected. Meanwhile the quarrel between the English and French mariners continued; for neither monarch had the power to stop it, or, if they had, was willing to let it proceed. It seems probable that Philip conceived the English monarch was a party to it, for he cited Edward to appear at his court at Paris, as his vassal, the duke of Guienne, to answer for the deeds of his mariners. Unwilling to come to an open rupture, Edward now sent his brother Edmund to negotiate an accommodation. The mariners of Guienne had aided those of the Cinque Ports, and, enraged at this circumstance, Philip refused to accede to any reasonable terms. He insisted that Edward should appear at his court in Paris, in person, to settle the matter. Edmund, duke of Lancaster, was about to return without having succeeded in his mission, when the queen-dowager and the reigning queen of France stepped in and interposed their good offices. The most difficult circumstance to adjust, they said, was the point of honour with Philip, who was indignant at the injuries inflicted on his subjects by his subvassals of Guienne; but if Edward would once consent to give him seizin and possession of Guienne, he would think his honour fully repaired, and it should be instantly and freely restored. All other differences would be easily settled, according to the representations of these fair politicians, if Edward would only gratify Philip on this one important point. It is difficult to conceive how such a politic prince as Edward was could be blind to the consequences of such a concession. Yet so it was. On being consulted, he allowed himself to be deceived by the artifice. The duke of Lancaster was empowered to sign and execute the treaty between the two queens: Philip solemnly promising to execute his portion of it. This done, the citation for Edward to appear at the court of France was recalled. He was no longer wanted there, for he was no longer a vassal of the French crown. He had given back the territories which he held of that crown, and Philip refused to abide by the treaty and his solemn promise to restore them. The citation was subsequently renewed, and upon Edward not appearing, Guienne, by a formal sentence, was declared to be confiscated. Thus, while Edward was employing all his cunning to obtain the kingdom of Scotland, he lost his continental province of Guienne by open fraud.

Meanwhile John Baliol, king of Scotland, had thrown off the English yoke. In October, A.D. 1295, taking advantage of the quarrel between the kings of England and France, he signed a treaty with Philip the Fair, by which they pledged themselves to make common cause against King Edward, and not to make peace except by mutual consent. It appears to have been the prospect of an immediate war with Scotland that chiefly induced Edward to yield the point of honour to King Philip by giving him up, temporarily as he conceived, his fair province of Guienne. Philip appeased, he might have crushed John Baliol had he rebelled against his authority. All at once, however, he found himself defied by both these monarchs. Active preparations for war, therefore, was forthwith commenced: war with France to recover his undoubted property, and with Scotland to obtain that which was not his own. Having obtained the sinews of war by supplies from parliament—aids from all classes of his subjects—and seizures of money deposited in the monasteries for the purposes of the Crusades, and wool and hides ready for exportation—for which latter he promised payment on some future day—he got ready a powerful fleet and army first to wage war with Philip the Fair. He was detained at Portsmouth for several weeks by contrary winds, and while there the Welsh again broke out into open insurrection. Despatching, therefore, a small force to Gascony, and commissioning his ships to plunder the French coasts, which they did effectually, Edward turned his arms against the Welsh. Many towns and castles had been taken, and the English had been driven across the marshes with great loss; and it took him several months to suppress this renewed struggle of the brave mountaineers for independence. He carried on the war during a severe winter, enduring many hardships and dangers, but in the spring of A.D. 1296, the Welsh re-submitted to his sway. Madoc, their leader, surrendered to the conqueror; the most dangerous of the chieftains were thrown into dungeons for life: and after the country had been wasted with fire and sword, tranquillity was restored.

Having again conquered Wales, Edward designed proceeding to France, but was prevented by affairs in Scotland. The forces sent to Guienne to preserve the few places he still possessed in those parts, and to keep the war alive till he should himself be at liberty to punish Philip's perfidy, were placed under the command of Edmund, duke of Lancaster. Edmund died soon after landing; but the earl of Lincoln drove the French from most of the towns they occupied: but they were only won to be lost again. Philip's brother, Charles de Valois, recovered them all; and the Count d'Artois, at the head of a numerous army, defeated the English in several encounters, and finally expelled them from nearly all the country, with the exception of a few maritime towns. Meanwhile, the English fleet had ravaged the whole coast of Brittany, from Vannes to St. Malo, but it in no way contributed to the recovery of Guienne. These ravages, indeed, had the effect of inciting the Normans, Bretons, and French to make reprisals on the coast of England. On one occasion, the priory of Dover was sacked and partially burned; but before the invaders could get back to their ships with the plunder, the men of Dover overtook them and defeated them with great slaughter.

It was in the spring of A.D. 1296 that Edward led his army towards Scotland. It was not only John Baliol that had been roused to a sense of bondage, but the nobles themselves felt the degradation: the very men whose selfish or factious ambition had laid their country at the feet of the English monarch. There was a general resolve to throw off the yoke which Edward had so craftily imposed upon them. At first they proceeded cautiously. In a parliament held at Scone in the autumn of A.D. 1294, ostensibly

for the purpose of lightening the public burdens, directions were given that all Englishmen maintained at Baliol's court should be dismissed; and a council was appointed of four prelates, four earls, and four barons, who were to have the chief direction of all his affairs. Baliol was an unwarlike prince, and appears to have been distrusted by his own subjects. Some writers assert that he was even kept by them in a state closely resembling captivity. On hearing of these proceedings, Edward required that the three castles of Berwick, Jedburgh, and Roxburgh should be delivered to the bishop of Carlisle as a guarantee of peace while he was warring with France. With this demand the Scottish government pretended to comply; but they were at that very time negotiating an alliance with the French king; and when that treaty was concluded, the three castles do not appear to have been given up to the bishop, or, if they were, before Edward reached Scotland they had been recovered. Hostilities were commenced by the Scottish barons. While Edward was yet in Wales an army, consisting of forty thousand infantry and five hundred cavalry, invaded the country, laying it waste as far as Carlisle. That town was attacked by them, but they were repulsed. Another inroad made by the Scotch into Northumberland was equally unsuccessful. Meanwhile Edward had reached the Scottish borders. He crossed the Tweed with five thousand horsemen, and thirty thousand foot. Berwick was invested and captured, and the garrison with the inhabitants—men, women, and children—were indiscriminately butchered. The massacre continued for two days, and no one whom the victors could meet with escaped death. Many thousands perished, and the whole place was given up to pillage. Great wealth was found in Berwick-upon-Tweed, for at that period it was a large commercial emporium—a port whose customs amounted to a fourth of those of all England. From its extensive intercourse with foreign countries, it was termed "the second Alexandria." Edward with his host remained at Berwick a month: "Every man in the house that he had gotten." Whilst there, a messenger arrived from Baliol renouncing his fealty, and refusing to obey a summons which Edward had sent, commanding him to appear before him. "The felon fool!" exclaimed the king; "since he will not come to us, we will go to him." It *was* madness; for not only was Baliol overmatched by the English army, but there was now a division among the barons of Scotland. Robert Bruce, earl of Carrick, and his son of the same name, with several other of the Scottish leaders, had espoused the cause of Edward, and were fighting under the English banner. Earl Warenne, with a chosen body of troops, was sent to recover the castle of Dunbar: the countess of March, whose husband was fighting in the army of Edward, having delivered it to the Scots. Beneath the walls of that castle a great battle was fought; in which, according to English historians, the Scotch were defeated, leaving ten thousand dead on the bloody field. And now onwards went "the ruthless king." Roxburgh Castle was captured, and he marched forward to Edinburgh. He arrived at Edinburgh on the 6th of June, and immediately commenced a siege of the castle. After a few days' siege it was taken; and on the 14th of June, Stirling surrendered without resistance: the garrison having fled, its keys were given up by the porter. All the principal strongholds of Scotland were now in the hands of King Edward, and the conquest of the country, in the brief space of two months, was for a season accomplished. Edward went to Montrose, which he reached on the 7th of July. He remained at Montrose three days, and while there King John of Scotland came to him to sue for mercy, and to render up to him the fair realm of Scotland. Divested of his regal ornaments, and holding a white rod in his hand, he resigned his crown, sceptre, and "all the right he had, or might have," in the kingdom of Scotland, into the hands of the king of England. Edward now went to Aberdeen, from whence he sent Anthony Beck, the warlike bishop of Durham, with other military leaders, to "search the country," lest there might still be some bands in arms against him. Edward himself assisted in the search, penetrating into desolate places, but finding no enemy, he returned to Berwick. Here he held a parliament, and here, also, he received the homage of the prelates, barons, and knights of Scotland. Then having appointed John Warenne, earl of Surrey, regent of the subjected kingdom, he returned to London. But the conquest of Scotland was not yet fully accomplished. Edward had done all he could to annex it to his crown. John Baliol had been sent prisoner to the Tower of London; all the opposing nobility who had fallen into his hands were sent prisoners to England; all the strong castles of the kingdom were in his possession, and when he returned to England, he carried with him the regalia, the public records, and even the "stone of destiny" in which the Scottish kings were seated at their inauguration. But while Scotland was thus apparently prostrate at the feet of King Edward, there was still a hero within its borders resolved to struggle for its independence—William Wallace.

Having, as he conceived, subdued Scotland, and utterly destroyed it as a kingdom, Edward prepared to punish the perfidy of Philip of France. Instead of leading an army into Guienne, he resolved to attack the French monarch from the side of Flanders. Treaties were concluded by him with the dukes of Austria and Brabant, the earl of Flanders, Amadeus, count of Savoy, and other princes and nobles on the Continent, who engaged for certain sums of money to furnish him with troops. The great difficulty was to find money sufficient for his enterprise. It was, however, finally obtained; for parliament, entering into his views, granted an eighth of their moveables from the cities and boroughs, a twelfth from the rest of the laity, and a fifth from the clergy. There was much grumbling—especially among the clergy—but the amounts were finally obtained. But it does not appear that this war with France was universally popular. Humphrey Bohun, high-constable, and Hugh Bigod, earl-marshal, being appointed to command a small body of troops to create a diversion in Guienne, absolutely refused to serve except with the king in person, and they with thirty other barons retired from his court. Haughty as he was, Edward was compelled to conceal his resentment, and growing bolder by his non-resentment, the two earls refused

permission to the king's officers either to raise men or money within their own territories. Even then he was obliged to content himself with simply depriving them of their high offices, and putting others into them. There was at this time, in truth, a wide-spread disaffection. The money granted by parliament—the collection of which met with stern opposition, especially by the clergy, who were supported in their resistance by Pope Boniface VIII.—was not sufficient to supply the king's necessities, and he was obliged to assert his arbitrary power, and to lay an oppressive hand on all orders of men in the kingdom. Merchants were called upon to pay him forty shillings duty for every sack of wool exported, which was computed to be above the third of its value; and they were only allowed to export a limited quantity, he seizing on all the rest, as well as all the leather in the kingdom to dispose of for his own benefit. Then, again, the sheriffs of each county were required to supply him with two thousand quarters of wheat and as many of oats, which he empowered them to seize wherever they could find them; and the cattle and other commodities necessary for supplying his army were taken away without the consent of their owners. It is true he promised to pay an equivalent for these goods; but there were few who thought that he would ever be able, even if he was willing, to fulfil his engagements. Finally, in utter disregard of the feudal law, in order to increase his army he required the attendance of every proprietor of land possessing twenty pounds a year, even though he held not of the Crown, and was not obliged by his tenure to perform these services. All these measures created wide-spread disaffection; and before Edward departed for the Continent, it was absolutely necessary for him to make his peace with the clergy and the people. Hence we find that in order to preserve their fidelity he publicly excused his illegal exactions by the necessity of his affairs, and solemnly promised that on his return he would redress all grievances, make compensation for all losses, and for the future strictly observe the great Charter of their liberties. Meanwhile he entreated the prelates and nobles to suspend their animosities—to judge of him by his future conduct, of which he hoped he should be more master—to remain faithful to his government—or, if he perished in the present war, to preserve their allegiance to his son and successor.

During his absence, Edward appointed his son, Prince Edward, regent of the kingdom. He embarked at Winchelsea on the 27th of August, A.D. 1297. Three days after he landed at Sluys. It is said that his army consisted of fifty thousand men. But all his mighty preparations on this occasion proved in the end to be "Much ado about nothing." His expedition brought him no honour. His allies received their money, but their promised troops were not forthcoming. His antagonist, also, had anticipated his attacks. Philip had entered Flanders, defeated the Flemings, and captured the towns of Lisle, St. Omer, Courtrai, and Ypres. In a word, Edward was compelled to conclude a truce with the French monarch, and to agree with him to refer their differences to the haughty pontiff, Boniface. After this, in March, A.D. 1298, King Edward returned to England.

It was time he did return if he wished to retain the kingdom of Scotland. There was a great struggle going forward for the reassertion of its independence. A great leader of the people had stepped forth from their own ranks to contest the palm of victory with King Edward. There was scarcely a Scottish noble who had not sworn fealty to Edward and exhorted his countrymen to submission; but there was one man, not of noble birth, who was hiding in the mountains with his followers, whose proud spirit could not be subdued. This was the renowned William Wallace. He is said to have been the younger son of Sir William Wallace of Ellerslie, whose residence was in the neighbourhood of Paisley. Tradition tells of wonderful exploits performed by Wallace in his youth, all of which foreshadowed the hero and the patriot. With these tales, fabricated in a period when historians were living who could relate sober truths, this history cannot meddle. At the time John Baliol surrendered his crown and his kingdom to Edward, king of England, Wallace appears to have been about twenty-five years of age—a man of great strength, courage, daring, decision, military genius, and born to become a great leader and commander. His name is first mentioned in the month of May, A.D. 1297, when he was merely a captain of a small body of marauders, who were accustomed to infest the English quarters by predatory attacks. No doubt King Edward and his military leaders, in "searching the country," had an eye on Wallace and his band; but he escaped their vigilance, living in the woods a free man. After Edward's return to London, the numbers of this "outlaw" band of Wallace, increased; growing more numerous as the fame of their exploits was spread abroad. On a sudden, indeed, the robber chief was transformed into the national champion. He was joined by barons and knights; men who had paid homage and sworn fealty to the English monarch. The first person of note who joined him was Sir William Douglas, who commanded Berwick castle when captured by the English. Disregarding his oath, Douglas came with his vassals, and then the first blow was struck at government. Earl Warenne, the governor, was then in England, and his justiciary, Ormesby, was acting as his lieutenant. Scone was the seat of government, and it was captured by Wallace. Ormesby, with difficulty, saved his life by flight. Much booty and many prisoners fell into the hands of Wallace, and for the moment the English government was overthrown. The neighbouring country was at the mercy of the insurgents. Every place refusing them admission was attacked; and every Englishman who fell into their hands massacred. Other persons of note and rank now flocked to the standard raised by Wallace for freedom and independence. It was a golden opportunity. Edward was gone to the wars in France, and his government at home was weak through quarrels. To the standard of Wallace, therefore, came the Stewart of Scotland, and his brother, Robert Wisheart, bishop of Glasgow; and hither also came Sir John Graham, Sir Alexander de Lindesay, Sir Richard Lundin, and Sir Andrew Moray, of Bothwell. Robert Bruce, too—grandson of the Bruce who had laid claim to the Scottish crown—

ranks of Wallace. Trusting that the Pope
ılve him from the oath which had been ex-
n him, he joined the patriots. Bruce had
is oaths of allegiance and fidelity to Edward,
, before Edward returned to England—
m the sword of Thomas à Becket—but in
ıal enthusiasm, excited by the victorious
he patriotic Wallace, he could refrain him-
ıger; he cast his oaths to the wind, and
national cause.

these patriots, two armies were formed in
That on the western coast under the
of Lord Percy and Sir Robert Clifford, met
ıear Irvine. The two armies were nearly
numbers—thirty thousand. There was,
an equal chance of success had they en-
Then, however, the Scots came in front of
h army, the new-born patriotism of some of
died away. It seems probable that before
that army, they reluctantly obeyed the
of a plebeian general—that they were
his renown and authority, and desirous of
ınity of retiring from his standard. At all
ıen confronted by the English, Bruce, the
Scotland, Wisheart, bishop of Glasgow, Sir
Lindesay, Sir Richard Lunedin, and even
m Douglas, who had first joined Wallace,
peace, and agreed to acknowledge Edward
ge lord. One baron, however—Sir Andrew
ill remained true to Wallace, and many of
and knights of those who had so basely
im remained amongst his followers. But
no fighting near Irvine, for Sir William
for at this time he bore that title—retired
orces, still numerous and powerful, to the

her efforts to quell the rebellion appear to
made for several months, and in the interim
al spirit was roused in favour of Wallace.
defection of the jealous nobles was amply
ed for by the patriotism of the people. The
allace was swelled, not only by the middle
classes who owned no lord, but by many
the Scottish barons. There was one
eeling of stern uncompromising patriotism.
as obeyed as their leader and their prince.
ginning of September, A.D. 1297, the English
n from most of the strongholds north of the
allace was besieging the castle of Dundee
lligence arrived that an English army was
upon Stirling. Leaving the citizens of
continue the siege of the castle, he ad-
meet them. They met near the town of
The Scots took up a position on the north,
nglish on the south of the river Forth. In
he two armies were about equal—forty
men on each side—but the cavalry of earl
ıe, who commanded the English, was far
Wallace had the advantage of position:
eing chiefly posted so as to be concealed
rising ground. Fearing to attack him in
ition, Warenne offered him terms, but they
lly rejected. Wallace replied that he came
at, but to fight: to assert the rights of
ınd to set it free. Thus challenged, on the
morning of the 11th of September the English began to cross the Forth by a narrow bridge. It was a fatal step. Wallace poured his followers down from the hills upon the separated force and nearly all the English either perished by the sword or were drowned in the river. Cressingham, the treasurer of King Edward, by whose advice the advance was made, was one of those who fell, and as he had made himself hateful to the Scots, his skin was stripped from his body to be preserved, "not as relics, but for spite." Warenne had not crossed the Forth, and when he found the day was lost, he mounted his horse and fled to Berwick. The victory was complete. The English who had not crossed the river were dispersed, and much spoil was captured. The loss of the Scots was trifling in numbers, but the brave Sir Andrew Moray was slain. The result of the victory was more important than the victory itself. It proved to be the liberation of Scotland from the English dominion, for several castles immediately surrendered, and in a short space of time there was not a fortress within its borders that held out for King Edward. Wallace even crossed the Tweed, and ravaged Northumberland and Cumberland with impunity. He returned from his expedition toward the close of the year, when in an assembly of the principal nobility held at the Forest Kirk in Selkirkshire, he was solemnly invested with the proud title of "Guardian of the Kingdom," in the name of King John—for Wallace and his compatriots had, throughout this struggle, professed to act in the name of Baliol, apparently from a conviction that he was their rightful king.

When Scotland was thus lost, King Edward was in Flanders. Perhaps it was this event that hastened his treaty with Philip the Fair. It is said that Philip made efforts to include the Scots in its benefits, but that on this point Edward was inexorable. They were "revolted subjects and traitors," and must abide by the consequences of their rebellion. Such was Edward's ideas and determination. Letters were addressed to all the earls and barons of England, commanding them to muster the military force of the kingdom at York by the 14th of January, A.D. 1298. His command was implicitly obeyed. At the head of eighty thousand infantry and four thousand cavalry, earl de Warenne once more crossed the Border. He came to Berwick, but while there, letters from Edward arrived, directing him not to advance further till he should join the army in person. The greater part, therefore, of the forces were sent home, Warenne retaining a body of twenty thousand foot and one thousand horse to act on the defensive.

Edward returned to England in March. No note was taken of his failure in Flanders. We neither read of rejoicings nor disturbances on this occasion. At the same time Edward had to assume the airs of a gracious monarch to preserve the fidelity of his barons and subjects while he was in Scotland. He summoned his barons and other military leaders to meet him with their forces at York on the Feast of Pentecost. A still greater force than the last gathered at York, and while there he held a parliament, in which he passed several popular acts, and promised a confirmation of their charters. Great as he was as a warrior, he does not seem to have been able to move a

step without making some concessions and promises. At this time he restored to the Londoners the privilege of electing their own magistrates, of which they had been deprived by his father; and ordered strict inquiry to be made concerning the corn and other goods which had been seized before he went to Flanders, as if he really meant some day to pay their full value to their owners. By these popular arts, the barons and people were put into a hearty good humour with their king, so much so that he was enabled to march with nearly a hundred thousand combatants towards the northern frontiers.

Edward entered Scotland in June. No enemy was seen for several weeks, and there were but few inhabitants met with in his route. Wallace was in the interior collecting his strength, many of the chief nobility again assembling under his banners; but, as before, the nobles were not to be depended on. In the hour of danger many again stood aloof, hiding themselves from the wrath of the English king. It was at Falkirk, on the 22nd of July, that the opposing forces met. The Scots formed on a stony field at the side of an eminence in the neighbourhood of Falkirk. The infantry, greatly inferior to that of the English, was divided into four circular bodies armed with lances, and the horse, of which there were only one thousand, were drawn up in the rear. While Edward was mounting his horse for the combat, he was thrown, and had two of his ribs broken; but regardless of the pain he suffered, he remounted and led forward his cavalry. That part of his army, consisting of four thousand horse, was divided into three lines: the first led by Bigod, earl-marshal, and the earls of Hereford and Lincoln; the second by the war-loving bishop of Durham; and the third by the king himself. It was by the two former that the attack was first made, and the shock was gallantly met by the Scottish infantry. For some time they stood their ground firmly; but the Scottish cavalry, either from fear, or, what is more likely, from treason on the part of the commanders, having taken to an ignominious flight, after repeated charges of the English horse, the Scottish infantry was compelled to give way. The rout was complete: it is said that fifteen thousand Scots perished. Wallace himself fought bravely, but when his friends Stewart and Graham, and thousands who have left no name, had fallen, he retired with the remnant of his army to Stirling. He was followed thither by the English; but when they arrived he was gone, and for seven years after the battle of Falkirk little is heard of him. He appears, however, to have carried on his former system of desultory warfare, and to have been still engaged in animating his countrymen to a resistance of which he did not live to see the triumph.

Edward took a fearful revenge. Finding that Wallace had escaped from Stirling, that town was reduced to ashes, and the whole of Fifeshire was laid waste and given up to military execution. The city of St. Andrew's was burnt to the ground by the English, and Perth was destroyed by fire by its own citizens, on the approach of the enemy. But the country was not yet re-conquered. Wallace was deprived of his office of "Guardian of the kingdom;" but Bruce, and Comyn, and the bishop of St. Andrew's, were elected joint guardians, and the war continued. Bruce was on the side of the English at the battle of Falkirk; and it would appear that when Wallace was retiring from that "well-foughten field," they had a brief conference on the banks of the river Carron, from which he resolved on the first opportunity to embrace the cause of his oppressed country. Henceforth, therefore, Bruce was to be the patriot-leader of the Scottish forces; but there was no more fighting this year. Edward returned to England in September, not being able to find subsistence for his troops through the winter. He had obtained possession of the principal places of strength in the south of Scotland, but the whole of the country north of the Forth was still unsubdued.

It has been seen that Edward had promised a confirmation of the charters on his return from Scotland. That promise had been extorted from him by the earl of Hereford, the constable; and the earl of Norfolk, the marshal of England. They demanded that he would then and there—at York—confirm them; but he could not do it then: he said he must hasten to chastise the Scottish rebels. He promised and pledged oaths, however, that he would do what was asked of him on his return from the north. It was a matter of grave moment that he of all the English monarchs should confirm the charters, for he had frequently violated them in making preparations for his wars in Wales, Guienne, and Scotland. When, therefore, the parliament met again in March, A.D. 1299, the barons, undaunted by the "glory" he had obtained in the bloody field of Falkirk, and the might he had displayed, required the fulfilment of his promise. He, however, endeavoured to evade the question. He would give no direct answer, either one way or the other. He even retired from the parliament at Westminster, and secretly withdrew from London that he might be freed from their importunities. But the barons were no longer to be deceived: backed by the citizens of London and other great trading towns who had severely felt his exactions, they were determined he should ratify the charters without delay. They followed him, and he returned to Westminster, and there in Parliament granted the ratification so firmly demanded. In this ratification, however, he insidiously introduced a clause which destroyed the value of the concession, and struck at the very root of the Great Charter itself. That clause was "a saving of the rights of the Crown." Upon hearing this clause read, the earls of Hereford and Norfolk, with most of the barons, retired to their homes, sullen and discontented. Nor were the citizens of London less displeased. As the new confirmation of the charters was read to them by the sheriffs in St. Paul's Churchyard, although they poured blessings on his head as all the previous clauses were recited, when that one fell upon their ears their blessings were turned into curses. So loud and universal a clamour was raised by his bad faith, that Edward became alarmed. There was a prospect of rebellion in England; a rebellion which, had it taken place, would have shaken the very foundations of his throne. But he was too wise to let the sullenness and discontent of the barons and the people grow into such a consummation. He summoned the parlia-

ment to meet again before Easter, when the obnoxious clause was cancelled, and all that was asked of him in the form prescribed, granted. But, like his father Henry, he was not sincere in his concessions. He considered them only as temporary sacrifices of his high prerogative, and sought by all the means in his power to set them aside, and to overthrow the power of parliament. In after-years he contrived, on various charges, to punish and impoverish some of the barons who had aided in his humiliation. On one occasion he even endeavoured to raise a tallage on the cities and boroughs in his demesne; and, finally, he sent envoys to the Pope to ask, but in vain, that as his concessions had been extorted from him by a traitorous conspiracy of the barons, he would absolve him from his oaths and engagements with his subjects. The barons were unanimous in their determination to make him respect his oaths throughout the remainder of his reign: as will be related when he was once more embarrassed by a dangerous rising of the patriots in Scotland, he was compelled to respect his engagements as the will of the nation, and to leave those limitations on his own power and that of future rulers as a part of the laws of England.

It has been seen in a previous page, that Pope Boniface had been appealed to as a mediator between King Edward and Philip the Fair in their dispute about Guienne. As the best means of effecting a reconciliation between the two monarchs, Boniface proposed a double marriage. Edward, who was now sixty years of age, had long been a widower, and the Pope suggested and even urged his union with Margaret, sister to Philip; and also, that his eldest son Edward, now thirteen years of age, should be affianced to Isabella, a daughter of that sovereign. There was much mutual deception displayed between Edward and Philip on this occasion. Both kings affected great delicacy about abandoning their allies by such alliances, Edward of the Flemings and Philip of the Scots. Edward even urged, as an insurmountable obstacle to the Pope's proposal, that he had pledged not only his honour but his soul, that Prince Edward should marry either one or the other of the two daughters of the earl of Flanders. Moreover, he declared that he had sworn upon the Gospels never to make peace with France, unless it were conjointly with the earl of Flanders, even if it should be demanded by the Pope. But these obstacles were quickly overcome: Edward married Margaret in September, A.D. 1299, and his son was contracted to the Princess Isabella, a child who had only seen six summers. Previous to these alliances, it had been settled that there should be peace between the two monarchs; that Edward should make reparation for the ships taken by his mariners; and that Philip should place sundry towns in Gascony in the custody of the Pope to be held by him till the question concerning Guienne should be adjusted by peaceful negotiation. This treaty was not ratified till May, A.D. 1303, when Edward recovered Guienne, the earl of Lincoln swearing homage in his name to King Philip. No mention was made in this treaty either of Flanders or Scotland. Both countries were abandoned to the tender mercies of the two deceitful monarchs. Philip took a terrible revenge on the Flemings for the defeat of his forces at Courtrai when the war commenced, by a frightful massacre of the burghers and peasants in a battle fought between Lille and Douai: and Edward re-commenced his contest with the Scottish patriots in a spirit of bitter revenge.

During the four years in which the dispute between England and France was in the course of adjustment by marriages, and treaty, hostilities between the English and Scots had never been wholly suspended: now and then there was a truce for a few months, but neither party thought of peace. Soon after the battle of Falkirk, Pope Boniface interceded for the liberation of John Baliol from the Tower of London, and his appeal was effectual. Baliol was conveyed to his ancestral estate of Bailleul in Normandy, where he died at an advanced age. While Wallace, however, continued his desultory warfare, the regents, or "guardians of the kingdom," still acted in the name of King John. Perhaps no one wished the coward monarch back again; but he was still their acknowledged sovereign. In the year 1299, Edward was restrained from prosecuting the war in Scotland by the discontent of his barons. He assembled an army at Berwick, but the barons alleging his continued evasion of the charters, refused to advance farther, and he returned home. The consequence of this was that the castle of Stirling, which had been for some time besieged by the Scots, was captured. Having confirmed the charters and made his peace with the barons in the summer of A.D. 1300, Edward again went into Scotland. He entered the west marshes at the head of a great army; but after devastating Annandale and receiving the submission of Galloway, being distressed by a scarcity of provisions, and the frequent assaults and surprises of his enemies, he concluded a truce with the Scots at Dumfries which was to last till Whitsunday, A.D. 1301.

Walsingham records that while in Scotland a petition was presented to him from the regents and states of Scotland requesting him to permit John Baliol to reign over them in peace, and to allow the Scottish barons to redeem their lands from those of the English to whom he had granted them. That petition, he adds, was rejected with disdain. It is scarcely possible to conceive, if such a petition was presented, that the regents and states expected he would comply with its prayer. Edward was resolved, if possible, to trample the kingdom under his feet. He would not even allow the haughty Pope Boniface to interfere in his supposed rights of sovereignty over Scotland. The regents had appealed to Boniface to protect it from the aggressions of the "ruthless king," and while in Scotland, the archbishop of Canterbury arrived in the English camp with a papal bull in which he advanced his claim to that kingdom, and demanded that every controversy between the two countries should be referred to his court at Rome for decision. "If you have any pretensions," he said, "to the whole or part of the kingdom, send your proctors to me within six months, and I will hear and determine according to strict justice." Out of this demand arose a controversy between the Pope and King Edward, more famous for its ridiculousness on both sides of the question than for wisdom. The bold

declaration of Boniface, that the kingdom of Scotland did and always had belonged to the see of Rome, was both impudent and groundless. At the same time the arguments he used against Edward's rights to the kingdom were clear and convincing. In his reply, Edward attempted to prove the superiority of England by historical facts utterly devoid of data. He adduced it from Brutus the Trojan, who he said founded the British monarchy in the age of Eli and Samuel; supporting his position by relating events, of which nothing is known, before the arrival of the Romans. Then after laying great stress on the extensive dominions and heroic victories of the renowned King Arthur of fabulous memory, he descended to more recent times; but his arguments were as mendacious as they were fallacious. He asserted it to be a well-known fact, confirmed by all the records of antiquity, that the English monarchs had often conferred the kingdom of Scotland on their own subjects, and had even dethroned those vassal kings when unfaithful to them, and had substituted others in their stead. Edward the elder, he said, had, in his speech to the states of Scotland, distinctly claimed his superiority over their kingdom; and William the Lion had done homage to Henry II. for his crown. This latter *was* a fact, but no mention was made that William paid that homage when a prisoner, or of the formal abolition of that extorted deed by King Richard. If Edward had not had might on his side, he certainly could not have refuted the arguments used by Pope Boniface as to his want of claim to the kingdom of Scotland. Edward referred the matter to his parliament which met at Lincoln, A.D. 1301; and it was soon settled. The demand of Boniface was met with a bold defiance. "At no time," replied the barons, "has the kingdom of Scotland belonged to the Church. In temporal affairs the kings of England are not amenable to the see of Rome. We have with one voice resolved that as to temporal affairs, the king of England is independent of Rome: that he shall not suffer his independency to be questioned, and therefore he shall not send commissioners to Rome. Such is, and such we trust in God will ever be, our opinion." Whether the barons considered that their king had any just claims as regarded Scotland or no, it is evident they were not in a temper to brook the pontiff's insolent assumption of temporal power. Nor was it the barons alone who opposed those pretensions, for in the parliament of Lincoln, there sat also prelates, abbots, and burgesses, so that the clergy and the tradesman were equally averse to the Pope's pretensions, as the knights and the barons. Pope Boniface was compelled to put up with this stern reply of the English parliament, for he was not in a condition to visit Edward and his parliament with any ecclesiastical penalties. So far as he was concerned, this quarrel only resulted in learned dust: he had no power to enforce either his demand or spiritual pretensions. By a curious anomaly, indeed, he subsequently acted as if he had no doubt of the English supremacy over Scotland; for he wrote to the Scottish clergy, in which he sternly reproved them for their opposition to Edward, "his dearly beloved son in Christ." Had English gold wrought this marvellous change?

The truce having expired in the summer of A.D. 1301, Edward again marched into Scotland. This campaign, however, proved still more fruitless than the last. As he advanced the Scots retired, laying the country waste in their route, so that as the winter approached, he was compelled to retire into the town of Linlithgow, In January, A.D. 1302, by the media-



LINLITHGOW PALACE.

tion of France, he was induced to conclude another treaty with the Scots, which was to last till the 30th of November. At that time the war was renewed by Sir John de Segrave, who had recently been appointed governor of Scotland. This expedition was disastrous to the English arms. Segrave marched with an army of twenty thousand men, chiefly cavalry; but in February, A.D. 1303, it was utterly defeated by Comyn and Sir Simon Frazer, in a battle fought near Roslin. Scotland was once more cleared of its invaders: Segrave, with his brother and son, with many English knights, were captured, and most of his army were either taken prisoners or slain.

It was shortly after this that the ratification of the treaty between Edward and Philip was effected at Montreuil. By that event, Edward was left free to turn with his whole power to the subjugation of Scotland; Philip the Fair had left it to its fate. In May he was at Roxburgh, and in June at Edinburgh, his route being marked at every step by fearful outrages. Fields were laid waste, and villages burned to the ground. From Edinburgh he pursued his destructive and unresisted course to the heart of Morayshire, where, in the strong and extensive fortress of Lochendorb, built on an islet in the middle of a lake, he for some time took up his quarters. While at Lochendorb, many barons of the north paid homage and fealty to Edward. Bruce, also, again turned traitor to the national cause, and submitted to his sway. From Lochendorb, in October, Edward returned southward; the gates of every strong place to which he came, except one, being opened to receive him. That one was the castle of Brechin, commanded by Sir

Thomas Maule, who bravely defended it till he received a mortal wound from a missile. The garrison then capitulated, and, in the beginning of December, Edward took up his winter quarters in Dunfermline.

The only place that now held out was Stirling Castle; around which the last remnant of the Scottish forces were assembled for its protection. At the approach of Edward with his cavalry this army, however, dispersed without a struggle; and in February, A.D. 1304, Comyn, its commander, and other Scottish nobles made their submission. All those who submitted were secured in their lives, liberties, and estates, but subjected to certain pecuniary penalties. Some few who had been most active in their opposition were banished for short periods, but on the whole, on this occasion, Edward acted with more than usual clemency. The garrison of Stirling Castle still held out, and in a parliament held at St. Andrew's, in April, Sir William Oliphant, who commanded, with the men under his command, were declared outlaws. It was invested by Edward after Easter, and it was defended about three months against all his efforts, when its garrison was compelled to surrender at discretion. Oliphant and twenty-four of his companions of rank, all of whom except two were ecclesiastics, came down the hill of Stirling with a halter round their necks, and barefoot, to kneel before their conqueror. It is said that Edward's heart was touched at the sight, and that tears rolled down his iron face; but if so, his compassion soon vanished, for although he granted their lives, they were all sent to the Tower of London and other English prisons to languish in dungeons. As all the castles had been captured, and the chief men of Scotland had submitted to Edward, leaving Sir John de Segrave governor of the kingdom, in August he returned to England.

There was, however, yet one man in arms against Edward in Scotland—the brave and indomitable Wallace. He had not been included in the terms of capitulation. It was given out that he might, if he pleased, give himself up to Edward's "will and grace," but Wallace knew well the meaning of such an offer. He, therefore, after all the rest of the "patriots" had submitted, still continued to assert his country's independence. Before he left Scotland, Edward had endeavoured to discover the retreat of the hero and had failed. As it was feared that he might again arouse the patriotism of the people, the arts of treachery were employed to effect his capture. Those arts finally succeeded. He was taken near Glasgow and was conducted in triumph to Dumbarton, where his two handed sword was hung up, never to be wielded again by him in the cause of his country. It would appear that large sums of money were given to persons who had watched Wallace, and had assisted in his capture, and it is certain that Sir John Monteith was well paid either for his capture or safe keeping. Bound in fetters, Wallace was conveyed to London, where he arrived in August, A.D. 1305. His doom was speedily pronounced. He was lodged for one night in the house of William Delect, a citizen in Fenchurch Street, and on the morrow was conducted to Westminster, crowned with a garland of oak as a king of outlaws. He was arraigned as a traitor to the English crown. "Traitor!" exclaimed the undaunted hero; "traitor I could never be, for I was never a subject to King Edward!" But as a traitor he was condemned at this mock trial to be executed. He was dragged through the streets, at the tail of a horse, to a gallows standing at the Elms in Smithfield, and after all the horrid barbarities of an execution for treason had been gone through, his head was struck off and placed upon a pole on London Bridge, and his body was divided into four quarters: the right arm being sent to be exhibited at Newcastle, the left to Berwick; the right foot and limb to Perth, and the left to Aberdeen. But William Wallace was never more dangerous to the power of King Edward than when his mangled remains were thus exhibited. The very sight of them rekindled the flames of patriotism in the breasts of the beholders. There might be exultation in England at the fate of the hero; but there was mourning and meditated revenge in Scotland. In four months Robert Bruce was in arms to revenge his death, and the Scots were flocking to *his* standard as their champion.

DUMBARTON CASTLE.

John Baliol was now dead, and his son was in captivity in London. The name of Baliol was held in scorn throughout Scotland, it had lost its prestige. It is true that Bruce and Comyn had acted as regents in the name of King John; but this was policy. Both had an eye to his crown, and both had a claim to it. Bruce was the grandson of the competitor for it when Edward assigned it in trust for himself to Baliol; and Comyn was the son of Baliol's sister Marjory, and, failing King John and his issue, the heir of right to the crown. It was a strange compact when Bruce and Comyn consented to act as regents of the kingdom, for in heart they were rivals. At this time Bruce was twenty-three years of age. He had, as previous pages show, vacillated between submission to Edward and adherence to the cause of in-

dependence. On the whole he had inclined to the English monarch more than Comyn. Hence, when Scotland had been apparently settled by Edward's pacific policy, while he enjoyed King Edward's confidence, Comyn was an object of jealousy, and the more so because he represented the rights of Baliol's family. But the English king little knew what was passing in the mind of Robert Bruce. He was in London when William Wallace was executed as a traitor, and probably one who witnessed that sad spectacle at the Elms in Smithfield. If so, no wonder his heart was filled with the deepest revenge, which was probably mingled with remorse for having deserted the standard of the deceased hero. He did not remain long in London after that tragical event. In a few weeks he was on his road to Scotland with a threefold design in view: of avenging the death of Wallace, of rescuing his country from the English yoke, and of asserting his claim to the crown of Scotland. But in this latter design Comyn stood in his way; how was he to get rid of his rival? Ambition points out many ways to obtain its object: Bruce took the shortest. He arrived in Scotland, and there was a conference between him and Comyn in the choir of the church of the Minorites. What passed in words at that conference can never be known, as only the two chiefs were present; but there was a quarrel, and from words they proceeded to blows, and Bruce plunged his dagger into the breast of Comyn and hurried out of the church, on which, one of his friends, Sir Thomas Kirkpatrick, rushed in and completed the murder. Fordun says that the ancient feud between the two families was the cause of this catastrophe, but whatever led to the deed, it admitted of no hesitating policy. Bruce and his friends seized the castle of Dumfries by surprise, and immediately assumed the title of king of Scotland. That title was acknowledged. Barons and peasants flocked to his standard, castles were taken, and by the middle of March, A.D. 1306, he had penetrated as far as Perth, the English everywhere taking their flight out of the country to save their lives. On the 27th of March, Robert Bruce was crowned at Scone; prelates, earls, and numerous "knights and gentlemen" being present at the ceremony.

Edward was at Winchester when he heard of this sudden revolution. On receiving the intelligence, the earl of Pembroke was sent with a small army to check the insurgents, the title of "Guardian of Scotland" being conferred on him previous to his departure. Edward was now far advanced in years, but he proceeded to make ready to follow in person if his presence proved necessary. Proclamation was made that the prince of Wales would be knighted at the feast of Pentecost, and all the young nobility of England were summoned to appear at Westminster to receive the honour of knighthood with him. A grand spectacle was exhibited at Westminster on that 22nd of May. The degree of knighthood was conferred on Prince Edward and two hundred and seventy noble youths; the prince in the great hall of the palace, and his companions in Westminster Abbey. Then there was a great banquet. Two swans were placed on the table of the regal hall covered with nets of gold. Minstrels placed them on the table with great pomp and ceremony. Then the king rose and made a solemn vow to God and the two swans, that he would avenge the death of Comyn, and punish the perfidy of the Scottish rebels. Such were the vows of chivalry, which were often taken at the feast of the peacock, and probably the feast of the swans was held to be more important. The prince and the young knights took a similar oath as the king; and Edward conjured them, in the event of his death, to keep his body unburied till the vow was accomplished. The next morning the prince and his companions departed for Scotland, the king himself following by slow journeys, and travelling in a litter, by reason of his growing infirmities.

Meanwhile Bruce had been encountered by Pembroke in a wood at Methven, near Perth, and defeated. The partisans of Comyn had joined the English, to take revenge for the murder of their chief. The men of Argyle, under the command of Lord Lorn, nephew of Comyn, encountered the shattered remains of the army of Bruce, and again defeated them at Dalry. In these encounters, Randolph and some of his friends were taken prisoners, but Bruce with about five hundred of his followers made good their retreat into the fastnesses of Athol. For several months they became houseless wanderers. A price was set upon their heads and they were hunted like wild beasts. Their difficulties were increased by the presence of many of their wives and daughters, who cheerfully shared in their privations and dangers. As they penetrated farther and farther into the highlands, pursued by the English and the friends of the family of Comyn, their miseries became appalling. At length the wife of Bruce and other ladies were conducted to the castle of Kildrummil, and Bruce, with the remnant of his followers, took shelter in the small island of Ruchrin, one of the most unfrequented of the western isles. His flight was followed by the almost total ruin of his connexions and adherents left behind. The bishop of St. Andrew's and Glasgow, and the abbot of Scone were sent prisoners to England; his queen and his daughter Marjory, with his two sisters, Mary and Christina, and the countess of Buchan, the heroine who had placed the crown on his head, were all taken and committed to different prisons, while his three brothers and his faithful friends, the earl of Athol, Sir Simon Frazer, and several others were condemned and executed as traitors. The best blood of Scotland flowed in torrents, shed by Edward in the performance of the bloody vow made by him at "the feast of the white swans."

But the war was not yet over. Edward had taken his revenge: in the year 1307, Bruce suddenly returned to Scotland from his retreat in the island of Ruchrin to take a counter-revenge, and once more to fight for Scotland's crown. Thirty-three galleys bore him and three hundred followers from that lonely island to Carrick, the ancestral territory of his family. The English under Lord Percy were in possession of Carrick, and a numerous garrison held the castle of Turnbery. With his small force, Bruce attacked a body of English who lay near the place of his landing, and put most of them to the sword. He laid siege to the castle, but on the approach of a large detachment of the English army, he again took refuge in the

mountains. The spirit of the Scots was again roused within them. His exploit went forth through the land, and there was a great re-gathering of the patriots. War was rekindled, and it soon raged in various quarters. Douglas Castle was surprised by Sir James Douglas, its rightful owner, and its garrison put to the sword. The castle was burned to the ground. Bruce himself was increasing the number of his followers before he followed up the first blow he had struck in this new revolution, and when at length he took the field, he led his forces to victory. On the 10th of May, A.D. 1307, he defeated the English under the command of Earl Pembroke; three days after, he routed another force commanded by the earl of Gloucester; and then Pembroke and Gloucester having taken refuge in the castle of Ayr, he laid siege to that fortress.

When these events were transpiring, Edward was at Carlisle. He had advanced no farther than that city, for he had been detained by sickness during the winter at Lanercost. He was still enfeebled by sickness, but, exasperated at the intelligence of the defeat of the two earls, he made an offering of the litter in which he had travelled to the cathedral of Carlisle, and again mounted his war-horse. But his wars were over. The effort was fatal to his life. In four days he only advanced six miles, and then at the village of Burgh-upon-Sands he laid himself down to die. He expired on the 7th of July in the sixty-ninth year of his age, and the thirty-fifth of his reign. His latest breath was employed in enjoining upon his successors to prosecute the great design of his life—the conquest of Scotland. But if King Edward, a great warrior and powerful monarch, had failed in his design, as he had most signally, who was to accomplish such a gigantic task? History will unfold the sequel.

The character of Edward I. is stamped upon the pages of his history. His ruling passion was military glory. So long as he could obtain that glory, he cared little what sufferings were endured, either by his own subjects, or by those over whom he desired to extend his rule. His ambition engendered revenge, and his revenge wrought deeds of blood and desolation that mar his character as a king, a Christian, and a man. So fond was he of power, that had he not stood in need of the fidelity and assistance of his subjects, he would have rendered himself one of the most absolute monarchs that had ever filled the English throne. It was this alone that compelled him so frequently to confirm the charters, and at length bound him to keep the oaths by which he pledged himself to observe the limitations which they put upon his kingly power and the privileges they conferred upon the nation. Had the Scots, like the Welsh, submitted to his power; had they been less patriotic, there is reason to believe that his "confirmation of the charters" would have been annulled; and had the English succeeded in enslaving them they might have forged fetters for themselves. For it cannot be doubted that by their dividing and weakening his strength, the cause of liberty in England was promoted; and, therefore, Englishmen, through all time, owe a deep debt of gratitude to Wallace and Bruce and their brave adherents for their intrepid patriotism. Thus through Edward's ambition the tree of liberty took deeper root on English soil than in any previous reign of the Anglo-Norman period. But that ambition bore other and bitter fruits; for many a bloody foray across the Border in subsequent ages owe their origin to the animosity created by Edward's unjustifiable aggression on Scotland.

SECTION III.

EDWARD II., SURNAMED OF CAERNARVON.

Edward II. was peacefully recognized king of England by the unanimous consent of the nobles present with the army at Burgh-on-the-Sands, but the event was cautiously concealed in the capital for many days. Ralph de Baldac, bishop of London and chancellor of the kingdom, continued to put the deceased monarch's great seal to writs till the 25th of July. At his accession, Edward of Caernarvon enjoyed many great advantages which seemed to promise a glorious and happy reign. He was then twenty-two years of age, at the head of a great army flushed with many former victories, and inflamed with the most violent national animosity against the Scots, and animated with the most ardent desire of acquiring both riches and honour by the complete conquest of their country. Whatever reluctance the English barons had shown in former times to cross the borders of Scotland, it had at this time vanished, for their one desire was to complete its subjugation. They felt bound to wage war till its conquest was consummated, so completely had the deceased monarch infused his spirit into that of his army. But Edward II. was no warrior; he loved pleasure better than war, and his weaknesses soon brought down upon his head the contempt of his people. In his early youth he had betrayed weaknesses that might overthrow the strongest throne. Nay, he had not only shown himself to be a weak, but a vicious prince. He had committed wild excesses. Thus, in the year 1300, he had, with Piers Gaveston, and other accomplices, invaded the park of the bishop of Chester, and wantonly destroyed his game for which his stern father had imprisoned him; and on a subsequent occasion he quarrelled with the same bishop, for which his father forbade him his house, and ordered that he should receive no supplies from his exchequer. The deceased monarch did all he could to restrain him from his vicious habits, but all his efforts failed. It was in vain that he endeavoured to make him worthy of filling his throne: pleasure was his chief delight. Piers Gaveston appears to have led him captive, at his will, and hence, before he died, the king had driven him out of England, and he retired into his native country, Gascony. At the same time, he implored the young prince to eschew the company of favourites and parasites, and forbade him, on pain of his curse, to recal Gaveston to England. But forgetful of his father's dying injunctions, and his own solemn oaths—for he had sworn to obey those injunctions—Edward's first thoughts on his succession were to recal his minion. He revoked the sentence of banishment pronounced upon him, and "the corrupter of the prince of Wales" returned to corrupt the king.

Edward was in London when his father died; and

as it would have been dangerous for him to have refused to march into Scotland, he hastened to put himself at the head of his forces. He had been made a knight with all due solemnity: he must at least make a show of being a warrior. Besides, his father's dying injunctions had been conveyed to him, and his barons were not in a temper of mind to allow him to disregard them. Scotland was a field in which they still hoped to reap glory and rewards. So Edward joined them and led them forward. He marched as far as Cumnock, on the borders of Ayrshire, and then he marched back again. Some few Scotch barons at his summons met him at Dumfries, and paid him homage, and he was satisfied: no measures were taken for the reduction of Bruce, who was daily becoming more formidable. It was while he was in Scotland that he was rejoined by Piers Gaveston, the handsome youth of Gascony, on whom he at once conferred the earldom of Cornwall, with other honours and numerous estates. After this, having constituted Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, guardian of Scotland, he disbanded a great part of his army and returned to England.

It was autumn when Edward reached London. One of his first acts was to dismiss all the ministers of his father from their employments. Such a fate befel Walter de Langton, bishop of Lichfield; his offence being that he had reproved him while Prince of Wales, and as lord treasurer had carried out his father's order not to supply him with money for his extravagance. In every way he seems to have acted in direct opposition to his father's wishes and even dying injunctions. Instead of obeying his father's most solemn behest, to send his heart to the Holy Land, and not to bury his body till he had made a complete conquest of Scotland, on the 27th of October he interred it at the head of Henry III., in Westminster Abbey. His chief adviser was his favourite minion, Piers Gaveston, on whom he was never weary of bestowing honours and rewards. He was enriched and aggrandized with a rapidity and to an amount unprecedented in the annals of favouritism. All the money which the deceased monarch had set apart for the Holy War, was given him; he was married to Edward's niece, Margaret de Clare, and he was made lord-chancellor. Gaveston had the patronage of the kingdom, for the offices of the discarded ministers and judges were filled up by his creatures. Finally, when, in January, A.D. 1308, Edward sailed from France to marry the princess Isabella, he left Gaveston regent of the kingdom during his absence. Edward was married with great pomp in "Our Lady church of Boulogne;" and on the 7th of February, twelve days only after his marriage, he returned to England, being impatient to rejoin his favourite Gaveston.

Isabella of France was reputed to be the most beautiful woman in Europe. She does not appear, however, to have had any charms for Edward. His whole affections were set on Piers Gaveston. On his return, Edward and his bride were met soon after they landed by the fascinating Gascon, and the flower of the English nobility; and paying no attention either to his wife or those who came with her as guests to witness the coronation, or to his English subjects, he threw himself on the neck of his favourite, kissed him and called him "brother." Those who witnessed unseemly exhibition were disgusted; and two of queen's uncles, who were present, boldly expre their displeasure. The coronation took place on 24th of February, and none present could be comp to Gaveston "in bravery of apparel and delicac fashion." It was Gaveston who carried the cr and walked before the king and the queen; a circ stance which greatly increased the anger of barons. The ceremony was scarcely over, ind when they petitioned the king instantly to banish favourite. He would give them an answer, he s when parliament met after Easter. Meanwh Edward devoted his special attentions to the Gas for whom even Queen Isabella found herself neglect He bestowed on him the very presents which he h received from the king of France on the day of espousals. Nothing appears to have been withh from him that he could bestow, except his kingdo and it was said that Edward declared that if were possible, he would give *that* to Gaveston. was natural, all this had the effect of inflating t minion's mind with pride and insolence, and to incre the barons' resentment. It is said that Edward soug to disarm the wrath of his barons, but if he d Gaveston did all in his power to inflame it. It w his constant aim to outshine all the nobles of the la especially by his skill and magnificence in tour ments. At different times he unhorsed the earls Lancaster, Hereford, Pembroke, and Warenne, which triumphs he accelerated his momentary dow fal. Before Easter the barons had several meetin in different parts of the country, in which they bou themselves to stand by one another in procuring banishment. When parliament met, indeed, on 28th of April, Edward was compelled to consent he should be banished out of England for life, be Midsummer, and Gaveston to take an oath tha would never return. If he ever did return, the lates threatened him with excommunication. F he left England, Edward gave him fresh pro his royal favour. Several estates in England Gascony were bestowed upon him. He retaine in England to the last moment, and only parte him to save himself from the censures of the and the dangers of a civil war. And ther Gaveston left he did not go to Gascony. weeks afterwards it was discovered that he h appointed governor of Ireland, where he w in regal magnificence. He spent about a Ireland, during which time Edward was mak effort to get his banishment reversed. In th mitigating their animosity, honours and rew showered upon the barons, and having, as h removed all dangerous opposition, Gavesto called, Edward having previously successf ceded with the Pope to absolve Gaveston oath, that he would never again set foot i It would have been better for him had h oath inviolate.

Edward met his favourite in June, A Chester, and there was a loving greeting was ever more warmly received than w on his return from Ireland. It was not, certain that he would be allowed to re

land. Both had their parts to play with the barons before the reunion could be established, and those parts were acted well. Edward gave them ample provisions, and Gaveston affected deep humility; and hence, in a parliament held at Stamford on the 26th of July, the barons gave their formal consent to his remaining in England unmolested. Edward was now happy. There was great feasting and much revelry. Neither the king nor his favourite had grown wiser by their past difficulties. Edward gave the most magnificent feasts, balls, and tournaments, in all which Gaveston eclipsed the English nobility by his splendour and by the marks of royal favour shown to him. Gaveston became more insolent than ever. As the people still called him by his Gascon name—Piers Gaveston—he induced the king to issue a proclamation commanding them to give him, as he had done, the title of earl of Cornwall. Yet at that very time he was in the habit of indulging his wit in giving nicknames to the noblest born in the realm. He called the earl of Lancaster, the "Stage-player" and the "Old Hog;" the earl of Pembroke, for his height and pale features, "Joseph the Jew;" the earl of Warwick, "the Black Dog of Ardenne;" and the earl of Gloucester, the "Cuckold's Bird." Edward laughed at these rude witticisms, but the barons more than frowned. Warwick swore a terrible oath that he would make the minion feel "the Black Dog's teeth;" and Lancaster vowed that he would exact a terrible penalty for the nickname of the "Old Hog." The queen, too, was disgusted with the upstart's predominancy. So much was she neglected by her husband through the handsome Gascon, that she wrote letters full of bitter complaints to her father; and conceived an aversion to her husband which was never wholly removed.

A storm was gathering round Gaveston's devoted head. The barons held tournaments in different places, not so much to display their skill in warlike exercises as to concert his ruin. In order to avert the danger, Edward made a progress into the north; but that step accelerated the downfal of his favourite. In October he called a parliament at York. Royal progresses were expensive. Edward wanted money. His lavish expenditure had brought him into great straits. In that parliament Gaveston sat as earl of Cornwall; but where were the barons? Pretending to dread some danger to their persons from his power and treachery, they refused to attend. Parliament was adjourned to the 3rd of February, A.D. 1310, and still the barons were not in attendance. What was Edward to do for money? Gaveston could not vote supplies, and the barons by their absence plainly declared they would not. Convinced that while Gaveston was with him, he should never have his wants supplied, Edward sent him out of the way. It was but for a season; but finding he was gone, the barons said they would meet their king. They met in parliament at Westminster in March, but they came fully armed. Edward was in their power. He was compelled to assent to the appointment of a committee under the name of "Ordainers," to provide for the better regulation of his household, and to redress the grievances of the nation. This committee sat in London; but as Edward considered the "Ordainers" in the light of "Censors," he preferred the toils and dangers of a campaign in Scotland to their superintendence.

If Edward had prosecuted the war in Scotland in the first year of his reign, instead of trifling away his time with Gaveston, he might perchance have effected its complete conquest. All the strongholds of the kingdom were in his possession; a large portion of the nobility and people had submitted to the English government; and the potent family of Comyn, with their numerous adherents, had cordially embraced the English interest. Bruce, too, was at that time sick, and nigh unto death—a circumstance favourable to the success of the enterprise; but Edward had thrown away his opportunity for the delights of pleasure, Bruce had recovered from his dangerous sickness, and taking advantage of Edward's imprudence, and the distractions of the English government, by a series of wise, vigorous, and successful measures, reduced all Scotland, except a few fortresses, under his obedience.

Such was the state of Scotland, when Edward, to escape the surveillance of the "Ordainers," resolved to undertake a campaign to effect its final conquest. It was a Quixotic enterprise. He summoned the military vassals of the crown to meet him at Berwick on the 8th of September. That summons was but ill obeyed. Several of the confederated barons remained in London to assist the twelve "Ordainers," in preparing their ordinances for the reformation of the government. Nevertheless, Edward was enabled to march into Scotland at the head of a considerable army, and Bruce declining an engagement, and retiring into the north he advanced as far as Linlithgow without meeting an enemy. Want of provisions compelled him to return to Berwick, where he spent the winter with his much loved Gaveston, who had joined him in his route. In March, A.D. 1311, Edward sent Gaveston into Scotland to gather laurels, but Bruce had retired beyond the Forth to make preparations for the final expulsion of the English from Scotland, and thus ended this celebrated campaign of Edward of Caernarvon, for on Gaveston's return he set out for London to hold a parliament.

It was August when Edward reached London. Gaveston was left at Bamborough Castle. He met his parliament at Westminster. The "Ordainers" had prepared their ordinances, and they formed a subject of grave debate. With much reluctance they were finally confirmed by the king; but gladly sworn to by the lords and commons: copies of them, under the great seal, were sent to all the sheriffs in England. It was ordained by these famous ordinances that all grants which had been made by Edward since he had issued the commission, should be revoked—he had made several to Gaveston;—that all future grants made without the consent of the barons should be invalid; that purveyance, except what was ancient and lawful, should be punished as robbery; that new taxes should be abolished; that the great officers of the crown should be chosen by the advice and consent of parliament; and that parliament should be held once, or twice, if needful, in the year. It was further ordained that the king should not leave the kingdom, or make war without the consent of the barons; and that Gaveston should be for ever banished the king-

dom for the following offences:—for having given evil advice to the king; embezzled the public money; obtained blank charters with the royal seal affixed to them; formed a confederacy of men sworn to defend his cause; and estranged the affections of the king from his subjects. Such were the ordinances signed by Edward, but which he did not mean to observe and keep.

Gaveston was to leave the kingdom before the 1st of November. He went to Flanders; and, after his departure, Edward went to York. It would appear that his object in going to the north was to collect an army who would fight for him and his favourite. At all events, in January, A.D. 1312, Gaveston rejoined him at York. On his return, notwithstanding the clause in the "ordinances," to which Edward had sworn, that no grants should be made without the consent of the barons, Edward made his favourite a new grant of all his honours and estates. He even went so far as to issue a proclamation, declaring that his banishment had been illegal, that Gaveston was a true and loyal subject, and had returned in obedience to his command. The resentment of the barons now took the form of vengeance. Led by the great earl of Lancaster, they marched to York. As they approached, the king and Gaveston fled to Newcastle, and from thence to Scarborough. The barons followed, and while Gaveston shut himself up in the castle of Scarborough, which was deemed impregnable, Edward returned to York in order to raise an army to oppose his enemies. But he had no opportunity of fighting for his favourite. The castle of Scarborough was besieged by the earls of Pembroke and Surrey; while Lancaster posted himself between that place and York to prevent all communication between the king and Gaveston. Trembling for the safety of his favourite, and unable to collect a force for his relief, Edward sent his royal mandate, commanding them to desist from their enterprise. It was in vain. The siege was pressed with vigour, and in May, Gaveston capitulated. He surrendered to the earl of Pembroke—"Joseph the Jew"—who pledged his faith that no harm should happen to him. He was to be kept safe, in the mutual custody of himself and Henry de Percy, who had assisted in the siege, till the 1st of August, and if a general accommodation could not be effected by that time, he was to be restored to the castle of Scarborough. It was on these conditions that Gaveston capitulated. But if "Joseph the Jew" did not sell him to his bitter enemy Warwick, the "Black Dog of Ardenne," it seems clear that he made no particular provision for his safety. He lodged him in the castle of Deddington, near Banbury, in Oxfordshire, whither came a great body of armed men under the earl of Warwick to take him. No defence was made: the "Black Dog of Ardenne" seized him and carried him off to Warwick Castle. His fate was soon determined. At a council composed of the earls of Lancaster, Hereford, Arundel, Warwick, and other barons, it was resolved that, in accordance with the recent ordinance of parliament, he should be put to death. It was in vain that he threw himself at the feet of the earl of Lancaster—the "Old Hog"—whom he now called a "gentle lord:" his doom was irrevocable. He was hurried to Blacklock Hill, about two miles from Warwick, where his head was severed from his body by a Welsh executioner.

The news of this tragedy threw the king into an agony of grief mingled with fury against the barons. He meditated revenge. He repaired to London to collect money and raise an army; but as he had lost the affections of all classes of his subjects, few could be found willing to espouse his quarrel. The confederated barons approached London with a more numerous army than he could muster, and he was induced to treat rather than fight. In the year 1313 a brief reconciliation was effected. The barons asked Edward's pardon on their knees in Westminster Hall; they gave him up the plate, jewels, horses, and all the personal effects of their victim which they had seized at Newcastle; and then they were for the moment exempted from punishment. Edward promised his full pardon in the next parliament, and he performed that promise in words; but they were never sincerely forgiven. He resolved in his mind that if ever he had the opportunity, he would revenge the death of his Gascon favourite.

During this wretched struggle between Edward and his barons, an event occurred of importance in the general history of Europe, in which England was greatly concerned. This was the suppression of the famous order of Knights Templars. A previous page has recorded the origin of that order. For nearly two hundred years the brave Templars formed the most renowned portion of the Crusaders. Most valiantly had they done battle with the numerous hosts of the Eastern infidels. Those hosts had melted away before them, and nearly the whole of Palestine fell into their hands. They parcelled it out into kingdoms, and they erected castles and temples on every hand. At one time the whole East appeared to be within the grasp of their power. But their conquests were scarcely completed, when these Christian warriors of Palestine were called upon to contest its possession with the fiery Saracens. Their wars with these soldiers of the Crescent read more like romance than sober history. Victory alternated: now the Cross triumphed, and now the Crescent. But in the year 1299, the Crescent at length prevailed. At that period the zeal of Christendom had waxed cold. Europe no longer filled up the ranks of the brave Knights Templars, and the last remnant of these Christian warriors in Palestine were all slain or taken prisoners—waving to the last the red-cross banner upon the field of blood. Nor was this all which this brave order of knights was called upon to endure. Their defeat in Palestine was followed by their destruction in Europe. When all hope of retaining and recovering the Holy Land had fled, the Knights Templars, once the idols of Christendom, became not only unpopular, but despised and persecuted. Pontiffs, prelates, kings and nobles alike thirsted for their blood and possessions. Crimes were laid to their charge of which they were wholly innocent. They were accused of witchcraft, sorcery, ambition, and heresy. Pulpits which once rang with their praises, echoed with anathemas against them. It was in vain that they defended themselves against false accusations: their destruction was doomed. Philip the Fair, father-in-law of Edward of Caernarvon, abolished



Bruce at Bannockburn.

their order in his dominions; and he was not slow in following the French monarch's cruel example. In both France and England they were arrested, imprisoned, tortured, and put to death: the last Master of the Temple died in the Tower, and the Grand Master suffered martyrdom. Their great wealth was the principal cause of their overthrow; for both Philip and Edward laid sacrilegious hands on their gold and vast possessions.—*Sic transit gloria mundi!*

The downfal of the brave Knights Templars was not the only event of importance that transpired during the five years in which England was disturbed by the contest between Edward and his barons concerning his Gascon minion. During that period, Robert Bruce was firmly establishing his power in Scotland. In the early part of Edward's reign, he had endured great adversity. Pressed by the English and by the friends of Comyn, with a few followers, he had wandered like the brave Wallace in the Highlands, subsisting only upon the products of the chase. He had traversed the great lakes in leaky vessels, and had taken shelter in the huts of the poor fishermen. He had been hunted by blood-hounds, and had waded through the mountain-torrents to elude their scent. He had defied his enemies single-handed in the mountain-pass, and in the river-ford. But in the year 1309, a change came over his fortune. The houseless wanderer had then become the acknowledged sovereign of Scotland. At a council held at Dundee, the clergy—the most influential order of men in Scotland—owned him as their king. In that year a truce was concluded between England and Scotland, which was to last till August, A.D. 1310, and when the war recommenced, victory everywhere waited on his steps. One after another all the strongholds of Scotland, except that of Stirling, were captured; and in A.D. 1312, encouraged by the dissensions between Edward and his barons, Bruce crossed the Tweed with a large force, burnt the towns of Hexham and Corbrigg, and part of the town of Durham, and penetrated as far as Chester. But while Bruce was laying waste Northumberland, the English wasted Scotland, so that the people of both countries were doomed to suffer the calamities of war. There was plunder and massacre everywhere, but Bruce was the gainer. Not only had he obtained possession of the Scotch castles which the English had garrisoned, but England itself was in danger. Wherever the Scots mounted on their little hackneys, and carrying their bags of oatmeal wherewith to make their cracknels, or biscuits, there the people of England were reduced to the most abject misery: their towns were sacked and burned, their lands devastated.

Such was the aspect of affairs, A.D. 1314, when Edward and his barons were in a degree reconciled. It was time for them to be at peace with each other, that they might face the danger that was gathering around them. Scotland was lost: England was invaded. The one castle, that of Stirling, which still held out, was besieged. It was hard pressed, and its governor, Philip de Mowbray, had agreed with Edward Bruce, who conducted the siege, to surrender, if not relieved by the 24th of June. In the previous autumn, when Edward had in his parliament pardoned his offending barons, supplies had been granted to enable him to carry on the war against Scotland, but it was not till the spring of this year that any active preparations were made. It was then determined that the dominion of Scotland, which had been lost by intestine broils, should be recovered. Both the king and the barons as a body were unanimous in this resolve. Troops were collected from Flanders, and Edward sent for his military vassals in Gascony, Ireland, and Wales. His military tenants in England were summoned to meet him on the 11th of June, and five days after he marched with a great army to the relief of Stirling. On the whole, his summons was willingly obeyed, for though the earls of Lancaster, Surrey, Arundel, and Warwick were absent, they sent their vassals. Personally they feared to trust themselves to the king's power, and therefore remained in their castles. The army which Edward commanded is represented to have been the largest that had ever marched out of England into Scotland. It seems to have consisted of about sixty thousand foot, and forty thousand cavalry; all well armed and plentifully supplied with provisions. With this force, Edward arrived in the neighbourhood of Stirling on the eve of the Feast of John the Baptist: the day when Philip de Mowbray was to give up the castle if no succour came.

Scotland had been so long desolated by war, that at this time it was but thinly inhabited. All the force which Bruce could collect to defend his kingdom and crown, did not exceed thirty thousand men. But with this army he resolved to stand his ground—to conquer or die. He chose a formidable position. The left of his army was posted upon elevated ground above St. Ninians, extending through an undulating country; the right on a stream called the Bannock. The centre was partially defended by a morass, and the left by pits dug for the purpose, in which were inserted pointed stakes artfully covered over with turfs and rushes. His army chiefly consisted of infantry, for his determination was to fight on foot, and to meet the charges of Edward's cavalry with the battle-axe and spear. There was a partial engagement on the eve of the Feast of St. John, in which Bruce raised the hopes of his forces by cleaving the skull of Humphrey de Bohun in single combat. The night is said to have been differently spent by the adverse hosts: the English in feasting and merriment; the Scots in fasting and devotion. At daybreak of the 24th of June, the great host of the English advanced with bright shields and burnished helmets; embroidered banners and gaudy surcoats: the Scots having heard mass, formed to receive them. Onwards came the English archery and infantry, and there was a desperate struggle for victory. Onwards came the English cavalry, with the earl of Gloucester at their head, and their horses stumbled in the pits, and their ranks fell into irretrievable confusion. Gloucester fell covered with wounds. The Scottish horse—few in number, under the command of Sir James Graham—now rushed to victory; aided by the camp followers and infantry, who rushed from behind a hill armed with pikes and oxen goads, with wide pieces of cloth affixed on poles, which served as their heraldic banners. The English army wavered, and Bruce, seizing the favourable moment, charged the

main body, and all was lost. There was a general rout. It is said that Edward at first refused to fly, but urged by the earl of Pembroke, he rode to Stirling castle for refuge. That refuge was denied. True to his pledged word, that if not relieved by that day he would give up the castle to Bruce, its governor, De Mowbray, refused to open its gates to his fugitive king. Edward with a band of horsemen fled to Dunbar. There was a dreadful slaughter in that battle of Bannockburn. That of the English exceeded ten thousand: the Scots lost about four thousand. The spoil was enormous. Herds of cattle, droves of sheep and hogs, portable mills, casks of wine, and military engines, fell into the hands of the victors. Had not the Scots preferred these spoils to the pursuit of their enemies, who were scattered all over the country, but few would have escaped with life and liberty. The victory was complete. By the battle of Bannockburn the long-disputed independence of Scotland became established. The castle of Stirling surrendered according to agreement. In exchange for some of his English prisoners, Bruce obtained the release of his wife, his daughter Marjory—his only child now living—his sister Christina, who had been detained in England seven years; and also of the bishop of Glasgow, the earl of Mar, and others who had shared in their captivity. After the victory, Edward Bruce and Douglas ravaged Northumberland as far as Appleby, and returned home laden with plunder. In the two following years the Scots made incursions into the northern counties of England; but in their last inroad they were defeated both at Carlisle and Berwick.

England was at this period a scene of great distress and misery. There was a deficient harvest in the year 1314, and the price of corn became enormous. The next season was even more disastrous. There was a pestilence amongst the starving people; and a murrain amongst the cattle. In its ignorance, parliament added to the people's miseries. A maximum was fixed on the price of provisions, which aggravated the evil. To prevent the people from actual starvation, barley-bread appears to have been ordained as food, for the brewing of beer from grain was prohibited. The nobles also added to the general disaster. Not being able to find food for their retainers they turned them adrift, and the country was swarmed with plunderers. And in the midst of all this misery, the nation was torn by faction. The confederated barons, of whom the earl of Lancaster was still the chief, demanded the enforcement of the ordinances, and the king having no power to resist them, they turned all his officers and servants out of their places, which they either filled themselves or bestowed upon their dependants. Famine, pestilence, and anarchy, therefore, afflicted the kingdom at this time; so that when the Scots entered the country to plunder and destroy, there was no public spirit in the people or their leaders to offer any effective resistance.

Emboldened by this state of England and their successes, and invited by some of the Irish chiefs, in the year 1315 Edward Bruce with a body of Scots sailed to Ireland, to drive the English settlers from that country. After various conflicts, in A.D. 1316, he was crowned king of Ireland, at Ulster. This was in May, soon after which Bruce, king of Sco over to Ireland, and their united forces to twenty thousand men. They advanced but its citizens made such a stern resis they were obliged to raise the siege. As fa in Ireland as well as in England, it seen that it was chiefly want of provisions th them to retire from Dublin. The Scots no southwards, penetrating as far as Limeri Irish nowhere joined them, and the fam so appalling, and want and disease so thi ranks, that the two brothers were compelle to Ulster. But the reign of Edward Br

LIMERICK CASTLE.

land—if reign it may be called—was tran October, A.D. 1318, he engaged the English near Dundalk, and sustained a signal defea two thousand of his followers, were slain, small remnant escaped to Scotland.

Robert Bruce had returned to his ow before the defeat and death of his broth thither by a threatened invasion of his ki the English. Taking advantage of his a English made several attempts to renew Scotland. Their attempts in the south we by Sir James Douglas; and on the coast Sinclair, bishop of Dunkeld. "Sinclair!" Bruce, when he heard of his exploit, "Sin be my bishop!" At this period the Pope, tence of setting on foot a new crusade to Land, insolently published a truce betwee and Bruce for two years, threatening thos not observe it with excommunication. As he would not acknowledge Bruce king o but simply its "governor," he refused to when excommunication and interdict fol heeded them not. His spirit rose super superstitions of the age. In the year 1 under the ban of the Pope, he renewed his into England. The castle of Berwick fel hands: the town having previously been tre given up to the Scots by one of the Engli Subsequently he captured several towns umberland, and burnt others in Yorksh

followers returned home with much plunder and many prisoners, who were driven before them "like flocks of sheep." Enraged at these incursions, and still smarting under his signal defeat at Bannockburn, Edward resolved to make another grand effort for the reduction of Scotland. In the spring of A.D. 1319 a parliament was held at York, in which the barons and knights of Shires granted an eighteenth; the citizens and burgesses a twelfth; and the clergy a tenth to defray the expenses of the expedition. The military vassals of the crown were summoned to meet at Newcastle on the 10th of June. There was

KING'S CHAMBER, NEWCASTLE.

an apparent union between Edward and his barons at this time; for the troops which came to the rendezvous were numerous. A great army marched upon Berwick. It was invested by land on the 1st of September, while a fleet from the Cinque Ports blockaded it by sea. But all Edward's efforts to capture that town and castle proved abortive: both the garrison and its inhabitants defied his power. There was no attempt of relief by the Scots, for while Edward was thus employed, an army under Randolph and Douglas marched in haste to York, in the hope of capturing the queen. Isabella escaped, and the Scots then ravaged the country, meeting with no effectual resistance. A body of peasantry, under the command of the archbishop of York and the bishop of Ely, encountered them at Milton on the Swale, but they were easily defeated: about four thousand were slain, three hundred of whom it is said were churchmen, who wore their surplices under their armour. Edward raised the siege of Berwick to intercept this Scottish army, but Douglas and Randolph returned with their followers to Scotland in safety. These events were followed by a truce for two years. That truce was concluded on the 21st of September, "between Edward, king of England, and Sir Robert de Brus for himself and his adherents;" but no truce could put an end to the intestine troubles of England. The failure of this campaign sunk the character of king Edward still lower in the eyes of his subjects, and tended to revive the rage of party which had been concealed, but not extinguished.

Edward of Caernarvon could not live without a special favourite. He had lost Gaveston; but he supplied his place with another; and by a singular coincidence, one who was furnished by the earl of Lancaster, who had presided over the council when the Gascon was condemned to death. Among those whom the earl of Lancaster introduced to the court of Edward when he and the confederated barons had made a complete change in the royal household was a young man named Hugh le Despencer. He was of a noble English family, fascinating in his manners, and highly accomplished. At the same time he was gay, insolent, and avaricious. From the accounts given of him, he appears to have been the very counterpart of Piers de Gaveston, and considering Edward's taste, it is no marvel that he fixed his affections on him. The only wonder is, how the earl of Lancaster could have introduced the fascinating Hugh le Despencer to the regal court. He was chamberlain of the king's household, and it was soon discovered that he was high in the royal favour. His father, also, who was a man respected hitherto for wisdom, valour, and integrity, came in for a share of the royal bounties; and, as a natural consequence, for the barons' envy and wrath. Edward married his new favourite to Eleanor, the elder sister, and one of the coheiresses of the late earl of Gloucester, with whom he obtained almost the whole of the county of Glamorgan. But this did not satisfy his avarice. He encroached on the shares of his wife's sisters, and on various pretences invaded the rights and properties of his neighbours—the lords of the Marches. His encroachments provoked retaliation. He had castles, and his material wealth was enormous. He had flocks of ten thousand sheep; herds of a thousand oxen and cows; hundreds of swine; and arms and armour for two hundred men. His father's possessions more than doubled those of the son. They might have been satisfied with their wealth but they were not. All the avenues of favour and promotion were stopped by this one family; and hence they incurred the enmity of the barons. The lords of the marches commenced the struggle against them. They attacked the young Despencer's castles, and carried away his property. In this violence they were encouraged by the earl of Hereford, the king's brother-in-law, and one of the peers appointed to enforce the ordinances. The earl of Lancaster, also, who considered the promotion of his dependant as a personal insult, joined the earl of Hereford and the lords of the marches; and other barons and knights swelled the number of the enemies of the Despencers. By an indenture, all bound themselves in a common cause against their power and influence. Joining their forces, they marched to London, plundering the manors of the elder Despencer in their route. The earl of Lancaster led them to St. Albans, where he sent a message to his cousin, the king, demanding the banishment of the Despencers. Edward refused. It was not proper, he said, to punish them without form of trial. The confederates then moved onward to

London, where their cause was espoused by the citizens. Edward was at this time holding a parliament at Westminster, summoned to put an end to the disturbances in an amicable manner. The confederated barons went thither with arms in their hands; having previously drawn up a sentence of forfeiture and banishment against the Despencers. That sentence was confirmed by parliament. On the charges of having usurped the royal power; of appointing ignorant judges; of estranging the king from his nobles; of exciting him to civil war; and of exacting fines on all newly-created bishops and abbots before they permitted them to approach the king, they were found guilty, and condemned to be disinherited and banished from the realm as enemies of the king and his people. In this same parliament the earl of Lancaster and his party obtained an act of indemnity for themselves and all men of whatsoever state or condition, for their recent acts of violence against the Despencers, and then they returned to their homes.

Although Edward thus submitted to the imperious dictates of the confederated barons, it was only from stern necessity. The Despencers were exiled in August, but they were back again in October. Circumstances favoured their return. During that interval the queen had been insulted by the noble lady of Leeds castle. On her journey to Canterbury to perform some acts of devotion, she had applied for admission into the castle for repose, but was refused. Queen though she was, the lady Badlesmere did not want her company. Enraged at such an unwonted insult, Isabella flew back to London, and Edward raised troops and besieged the castle. It was captured, and Edward wiped out the insult offered to Isabella, by putting twelve knights who had defended the castle to death. Emboldened by this event, the Despencers returned and encouraged the king to take vengeance on *all* his enemies. He led his forces northward. The earl of Lancaster was in the north in open arms against the government of Edward. It had been alleged that before the truce of A.D. 1319, he had been in traitorous correspondence with the Scots, and that it was through his complicity Berwick had not been recovered by the English. That allegation might be true, for it is certain that at this time, when the truce was about to expire, both Lancaster and the earl of Hereford *were* in alliance with Bruce. Their compact was that Bruce should aid them against the king and the Despencers, and that they would use their power and influence to obtain for him the peaceable enjoyment of his kingdom. Some of the confederated barons, however, were not participators in this compact. On the contrary, they were ill-supported; for neither their former confederates, nor the Scots whom they expected, appeared to aid them in their struggle. On the other hand, Edward was assisted by many powerful barons, who, from their dislike to the violent measures of the confederates, flocked to his standard. Among his supporters were the earls of Kent and Norfolk, the king's younger brothers, Pembroke, Richmond, Arundel, Surrey, Athol, and Angus: all men of note and power. Edward advanced with a powerful army and met with but little opposition in his progress. Castles surrendered, and the barons surprised and unprepared, either fled or were taken prisoners. Edward reached Yorkshire where he was at length encountered. He was victorious. In a battle fought at Boroughbridge, Hereford was slain, and Lancaster was compelled to surrender. Many knights were captured. Edward's time of vengeance had arrived: the death of Gaveston and the violence done to the Despencers was now to be avenged. A court was convoked at Pontefract, the earl of Lancaster's own castle, consisting of six earls and a number of royalist barons, over which the king presided in person. Lancaster was arraigned as a traitor and condemned to die. Mounted on a grey pony, without a bridle, he was led to execution, and on an eminence outside the town he was beheaded. As he was of royal blood the ignominious part of his sentence was remitted; but fourteen bannerets, and fourteen knights bachelors, were drawn, hanged, and quartered. Some of the confederates fled from the country, and others were imprisoned; while the estates of all were confiscated: the greater portion being given to the Despencers. In a parliament held at York, three weeks after Easter, A.D. 1322, the sentence of exile passed on the Despencers was annulled, and Hugh, the father, was created earl of Winchester. In this parliament, also, the Act of indemnity passed in the previous year was repealed, it having been "sinfully and wrongfully granted;" the assent of "the prelates, earls, barons, knights of shires, and commonalty being given for dread of the great force which the confederated barons suddenly brought to the parliament of Westminster, with horse and arms, in affray and abasement of the people." Nor was this all that was done in this parliament. The ordinances, which had been made ten years before, were revoked; and all provisions "made by subjects against the royal power of the ancestors of King Edward" were to cease and lose their effects for ever.

Edward of Caernarvon was now at length in the plenary possession of sovereign power. His enemies were laid at his feet, and his parliament was obsequious. But he had yet one disgrace to wipe out of his escutcheon—his defeat at Bannockburn. He resolved to wipe that out, and to win back the crown of Scotland. In this resolve he was aided by his subjects. The barons and knights of shires granted him a tenth of their moveables; the citizens and burgesses a sixth; and the clergy fivepence in the mark of their annual revenue, to defray the expenses of the expedition. A great army assembled in July at Newcastle, from whence Edward marched into Scotland. Bruce retired before him, carrying away all provisions. This was a more effectual step of securing a victory than fighting. Edward's army was soon reduced to such distress that he was compelled to march back to England. There was famine and sickness among his troops, and his horses were dying for want of provender. Bruce waited for this opportunity of attacking the English army. As Edward was marching back to the border he left his entrenchment at Culross, in Fifeshire, and falling upon his rear, the English army became disorganized. Edward fled with a portion of his troops and took up a strong position near Ryland Abbey, in Yorkshire. He felt himself secure, but on a sudden a body of Scottish

ıcked him, obtained a victory, and he fled
' to York. The Scots swept the country
ery walls of that city; and then, on the
rch, A.D. 1223, Edward was compelled to
to this long and ruinous war. A sus-
ırms was agreed upon for thirteen years,
vas not to be interrupted by the death of
contracting parties. This was virtually
ɔdgment of the independence of Scotland,
ruce was left in full possession of that

ıact between Edward of Cærnarvon and
ɔe was looked upon by the English as a
ɹace. But if the nation was disgraced, it
d the inestimable blessing of peace. But
as not of long duration. The king and
ers flattered themselves that they had
l their difficulties, that henceforth they
no enemies to encounter. This was a
.t this very time there were signs of an
storm. While the Despencers were
he sunshine of royal favour their doom
hing. They had still many enemies, the
ıble of whom was Queen Isabella. They
her dower, had kept her in a state of
ty and dependence, and had sowed dis-
ɑ her and her husband. Isabella, there-
resolved to have her revenge. Mean-
spiracy had been formed to cut off the
.cer, and then by a bold attempt to liberate
ɔaptives taken at Boroughbridge from the
which they had been immured. This
ıiled in its main objects, but one of the
ınt of these prisoners, who was still lying
ntence of death, contrived to escape from
ɔf London. This was Roger Mortimer,
ɡmore in the Marches, one of the most
ınd daring of the Lancastrian party.
ɔaped to France.

ne Philip the Long, king of France, was
ɜ brother Charles the Fair had succeeded
ne. According to custom, Charles had
King Edward to come and perform hom-
French dominions. He was to appear
at Amiens on the first of July, A.D. 1324.
es had recently existed between Charles
ther-in-law Edward, and hence this sum-
ıade imperative. Charles was resolved
l should perform homage for Gascony in
ither Edward nor the Despencers felt easy
; before the brother of Queen Isabella;
ause he had spoken to her "words of chas-
secret," and the Despencers, because they
er dower, and had sowed discord between
king. The matter of the king's journey
t before parliament, and it was resolved
nbassy to France to procure delay. This
ısisting of the earl of Kent and the arch-
ublin, was graciously received, but the
fruitless. Charles overran a great por-
ɪrd's territories on the continent, and took
ɜ castles and towns. The matter grew
ward began to make preparation for the
ıis territories. At this juncture, it was
the embassy, who still lingered in France,
that if Isabella would come over to France, she might be able to procure an accommodation between her husband and brother. This proposal was communicated to the court of England, and Isabella, who had long desired to quit the kingdom, persuaded her husband that she was certainly the proper person to settle all differences. Her brother, she said, would yield to fraternal affection what he had denied to ambassadors and statesmen. Glad of any expedient to avoid a war with France, and not dreaming of any great danger from such a mission, Isabella was deputed to the court of her brother with power to conclude a treaty. Her mission was successful, though it was not very advantageous to King Edward. Its terms were that the duchy of Guienne was to be given up to the king of France, who was to restore it to Edward as soon as he had done homage for it in person. He was to come to perform that ceremony at Beauvais on the 29th of August, A.D. 1325. But if Edward and the Despencers were reluctant to go to France before, now that the injured queen was there they were still more reluctant. No doubt she had poured into her brother's ear her tale of wrongs: how then could they face her at his court? On the advice of parliament, however, Edward, who had reluctantly confirmed the treaty, prepared for his journey to Beauvais. He set out on that journey, but he very conveniently fell sick in the abbey of Langedon, and sent to France for a short delay. But neither Charles nor Isabella long desired his presence in France. In September they induced him to transfer his foreign possessions in Gascony and Ponthieu to his son Edward, then thirteen years of age, and the young prince went to Paris and there did homage for them to his feudal lord. But Edward had not yet surmounted his difficulties. As soon as the ceremony was performed, he expected that the queen and Prince Edward would return to England. But they came not. Pressing letters were sent to urge their return, but still they tarried in France. A letter was sent to Charles stating that it was easy for all men to perceive that "the queen did not love him as she ought to love her lord," and it was unheeded. Isabella had previously declared that she could not return, because Sir Hugh le Despencer was her enemy, and her life would be in danger, at which "her lord" marvelled, seeing that at her departure she had given him—Despencer—especial promises, signs, and proofs of certain friendship. In a letter to his son, Prince Edward, written on the 1st of March, A.D. 1326, Edward unwisely defended his favourite in the strongest terms. He was his dear and loyal servant. In that same letter he commanded the young prince not to contract any marriage without his consent, and bitterly adverted to the alliance of Queen Isabella with Roger Mortimer, "a false traitor, and the king's mortal enemy."

Whether Isabella had any communication with Roger Mortimer before she went to France is not clear, but it is certain that she very soon contracted an alliance with him for the purposes of her long-meditated revenge on the Despencers, an alliance also which in the end corrupted her chastity. On reaching France, after his escape from the tower, Mortimer had become the head of the Lancastrian party. Those exiles who had escaped at the death of Lancaster,

flocked around him; and when the queen arrived at Paris, they swarmed in her court. Mortimer became the chief of her household: and history more than hints there was a connection between them of a more endearing and guilty nature—that Mortimer was Isabella's paramour. It is likely, for Mortimer was gallant, handsome, intriguing, and had no great reputation for morality; and Isabella was still young and beautiful. But if there is no ground for this accusation, it is certain that there was a close political friendship existing between them. Both had suffered wrongs, and both burned to revenge them. On her first arrival in Paris, her brother Charles had sworn, "by the faith he owed to God and his lord, St. Denis," the patron of knighthood in France, that he would avenge her wrongs; but Despencer had contrived, by rich presents, to corrupt his knightly faith. Despencer also induced Edward to write to the Pope, imploring him to interfere with the French king to restore his wife and son to him: at the same time, sending "much gold and silver" to the cardinals and prelates at Rome, to plead his cause with the holy father. Accordingly the Pope wrote to Charles the Fair, desiring him to send his sister back to England, and her husband, on pain of excommunication. Charles feigned compliance. He caused it to be intimated to Isabella, that if she did not go, he would drive her out of his kingdom; but it seems clear that, with his connivance, she took refuge with his vassal the count of Hainault. In order to bind the count to her interests, Isabella affianced Prince Edward to his second daughter, Philippa, in utter defiance of "her lord's" commands. John of Hainault, the brother of the count, warmly espoused the cause of Queen Isabella. Deeming it to be the duty of all true knights to aid with their loyal power, "all dames and damsels in distress," he gathered an army of two thousand men to fight under his banner for the injured dame. The English exiles, who were a numerous body, and all men of high rank, joined them. Even Edward's cousin, the earl of Richmond, and the lord Beaumont, and the bishop of Norwich, who had been sent on an embassy to France, declared for Queen Isabella. Mortimer took the lead in this enterprise. John of Hainault conceived that it was full of dangers, but his fears were ill-founded. Edward and the Despencers still had numerous enemies in England. For every one they had crushed, scores appear to have sprung up. There were busy tongues in England at that period. Orders were issued for the apprehension of all "spreaders of false reports" against the king, but they were ill-obeyed. Adam Orleton, who had been deprived of the temporalities of the see of Hereford for his devotion to the confederated barons, industriously spread abroad his vices, and others taking up his tale, there was soon wide-spread disaffection. Edward had given orders to the wardens of the Cinque Ports, and the admirals of the north and south, to have their fleets ready to oppose a descent; but before any descent was attempted, the fleets were won over by evil reports of the king, to the cause of Queen Isabella. So, also, were the barons, who had of late adhered to the king. His demerits became so palpable, indeed, all at once, that he had but few friends left in the kingdom. But the chief cause of this remarkable revolution, was the common hatred of the Despencers.

It was on the 24th of September, that Isabella and her little army landed at Orwell, in Suffolk. It was a small force to invade so great a kingdom; but before the landing, the work was accomplished. The mine was ready to be sprung: the match only was wanted to cause the explosion. On landing, a proclamation was issued, stating that the queen, the prince, and the king's brother, the earl of Kent, had come to free the nation from the tyranny of Hugh Despencer. That was sufficient. Troops had been sent to oppose their landing; but instead of opposing, they joined the invaders. The queen and her son stayed three days at the abbey of the Black Monks, at St. Edmund's Bury, and thither came from all parts prelates, barons, and knights, to make common cause with the queen. Even the earl of Norfolk, the king's other brother, tended his services; and the archbishop of Canterbury sent money in aid of the enterprise. Never was king so suddenly and universally abandoned as was Edward of Cærnarvon. There was not a knight who would draw the sword for him. He appealed to the citizens of London, but in vain. They would honour the king, the queen, and the prince, they said, and would shut their gates against the foreigners brought into the country, but their privileges would not admit them to fight for him. The Londoners had on many occasions readily drawn their swords in the cause of freedom, and hence their refusal was not for the lack of valour, but of will. Thus shorn of hope, Edward adopted the only course left to him. With the two Despencers and his chancellor, Baldock, he fled from London, and he had scarcely left, when the populace rose and murdered the bishop of Exeter, whom he had appointed governor, because he had been sent by the king as envoy to France, to induce the queen and her son to return. Before he quitted London, Edward issued a proclamation offering a thousand pounds for the head of Mortimer; but in a few days he knew not where to lay his own. He fled to Wales, but the Welsh disowned him and denied him refuge. He then put to sea with his prime favourite, the young Despencer. The elder had thrown himself into Bristol, but on the approach of Queen Isabella, the citizens compelled him to surrender at discretion. His fate was soon sealed, After a brief and mock trial, outside the walls of Bristol, there was seen hanging the body of a man once reputed throughout the nation as a man of honour, wisdom, and integrity. Four days did it hang dangling on the gibbet, when all but the head was thrown to the dogs, and that was sent to be exhibited on a pole at Winchester, in derision of his earldom. From Bristol, a proclamation was issued summoning Edward to return to his throne. He was not wanted there. It was simply issued to justify a measure already resolved upon, that of appointing Prince Edward "Guardian of the kingdom." That was done in an assembly of the prelates and barons, on the 26th of September. Meanwhile, Edward of Cærnarvon was living the life of an outcast. When he put to sea, he made for the Isle of Lundy, but stress of weather compelled him to land on the coast of South Wales. He concealed himself in the mountains near Neath Abbey, in Glamorgan-

NEATH ABBEY.

his retreat was soon discovered. His
ugh Despencer, and his chancellor, Bal-
etrayed by the Welsh for gold, and were
› woods of Lantressan. The king then
to the earl of Lancaster his cousin, and
hat earl whom he had put to death at
Edward was conducted to the castle of
ınd Despencer to Hereford. Isabella was
keeping the festival of All Saints, and
o hope of mercy for him. The same
ıad tried the father at Bristol now sat
on the son at Hereford. Sir William
of the Lancastrian exiles, pronounced
eath upon him, as a wicked and attainted
mutilated body was hanged on a gallows
;h. His head was sent to London, and
et it with great triumph on the bridge.
Arundel and others who had promoted
Lancaster, were beheaded; but Baldock,
ıscaped execution—he died miserably in

ion of affairs was now in the hands of
la and Mortimer. It was necessary that
ıould be done to restore order. All
was dissolved. The courts of justice
ınd there was lawless violence every-
ɜre were mobs in London, called the
o plundered and murdered whom they
there were mobs in other cities equally
was resolved, therefore, that the king
ɔosed, and that his son, then only fourteen
, should be raised to the throne. In a
eld at Westminster, on the 7th of January,
ung Edward was declared king. By a bill of six articles, it was resolved that the reign of Edward of Cærnarvon was ended. The charges contained in these articles were incapacity for government, negligence, spending his time in trifling amusements, violating some of the immunities of the church, and banishing, disinheriting, and executing many of the nobles of the land. There can be no doubt but Isabella had been a party to this solemn act of deposition—that she had promoted it by all the means in her power; but on hearing of it she affected great grief. It is said that she shed a flood of tears, and even fell into fits from the violence of her sorrow. But all was false and hollow. Prince Edward, too, was equally insincere, for he declared that he would not reign while his father was living, and yet if he had any scruples, they were quickly removed. To render the transaction more plausible, parliament sent a deputation to the king at Kenilworth, to inform him of the sentence of deposition, and procure his consent. This deputation consisted of prelates, earls, barons, with two knights from each county, and two representatives from every borough in the kingdom. The first who entered the king's presence were the bishops of Hereford and Lincoln—two of his bitterest enemies. By promises and threats, Edward was induced by these prelates to resign his crown. Then the other members of the deputation were ushered in, at the sight of whom, the unhappy monarch fell into a swoon. On recovering, Sir William Trussel addressed him in the name of the parliament and the people of England. He was told by that inexorable judge that all fealty and allegiance were withdrawn from him, and that henceforward he would be considered only as a subject, and not a king. As he ceased, Sir Thomas Blount, steward of the household, stepped forward, and, breaking his staff of office, declared that all persons in his service were by that act freed therefrom and discharged. And thus ended, on the 20th of January, the reign of Edward of Cærnarvon. Four days after, heralds proclaimed the accession of his son, and on the 29th, Edward was crowned at Westminster by the archbishop of Canterbury.

After his deposition, Edward was committed to the custody of his cousin, Henry earl of Lancaster. It was supposed by Isabella—in whom nearly the entire authority of the crown was vested, and who was herself under the rule of Mortimer—that as Henry of Lancaster had the death of a brother to avenge, he would prove a rigid gaoler. It was otherwise. Touched by his cousin's miseries, Lancaster treated him with tenderness and humanity. In this age of revenge, his heart was not hardened or callous to suffering. But his kind treatment of the deposed monarch was not considered consistent with the safety of Isabella and her son, and especially of her "gentle Mortimer." Accordingly, Henry of Lancaster was relieved of his charge: Edward was given over to the custody of Sir John Maltravers, a man of fierce disposition, and who likewise had cruel wrongs to avenge. The object of Maltravers in his treatment of the captive, appears to have been to break his heart by hard usage. He hurried him from castle to castle by night, thinly clad and bareheaded, and treated him with scorn and contempt. At length Edward was lodged in Berkeley Castle, near the Severn. Lord

Berkeley was associated with Maltravers in his guardianship, and he, like Henry of Lancaster, proved too merciful a keeper. By this time there were signs of a change in the sentiments of the people towards the deposed monarch. They had looked upon him as an execrable tyrant, and upon the queen and Mortimer as angels sent for their deliverance from his tyranny. As, however, the people became aware of the criminal union of Isabella and her paramour, they began to pity the sufferings of the captive. Schemes were set on foot at Bristol, and by the Dominican friars and others, to set him at liberty. Some of the monks had the boldness to denounce from the pulpit the immoral connection existing between the queen and Mortimer. But all this only hastened the death of Edward. There was danger while he was living; and so when the Lord Berkeley was detained at his manor of Bradley by sickness, his castle, by command of Mortimer, was entrusted to "two hell-hounds that were capable of more villanous despite than became either knights, or the lewdest varlets in the world." These "hell-hounds" were Thomas Gourney and William Ogle, names ever infamous in the page of history. Their work was soon done. On a dark night towards the end of September, shrieks of anguish were heard to issue from the walls of Berkeley Castle, and "many being awakened therewith from their sleep, prayed heartily to God to receive his soul, for they understood by those cries what the matter meant." They were the "shrieks of an agonizing king." In the morning it was found that Edward of Cærnarvon had been murdered. The people were told that he had expired suddenly in the night, but though his body bore no marks of violence, the distortions of the face of the dead monarch gave the lie to the tale; and when, in after days, Mortimer was about to forfeit his life for his evil deeds, he confessed that he had commanded the commission of the crime. The remains of the murdered king were privately buried in the abbey church of Gloucester; and may his terrible death be considered by posterity as some sort of atonement for his faults of conduct and character as a man and a monarch. The great error of his life, and that which brought upon him misery and death, was his unbounded attachment to his favourites, Gaveston and the two Despencers. In itself this attachment was not criminal; but their imprudence, insolence, ambition, and avarice, excited universal hatred and indignation, and involved both themselves and their sovereign in ruin. It was a terrible penalty to pay for over-indulgence; and men soon saw that they had been too clamorous for the blood of their unhappy monarch.

SECTION IV.

EDWARD III.

When Edward III. was raised to the throne of his deposed father by a people who had thirsted for, and had too easily obtained, their wished-for revenge, the parliament, which at the time of his coronation was still sitting, appointed a regency of twelve prelates and barons to carry on the government. In reality, however, Queen Isabella and the Lord Mortimer ruled the kingdom. This same parliament, also, reverse the attainders which had in the late reign been passe against the Lancastrian party, and confiscated th estates of the Despencers and their adherents; th queen and her favourites taking possession of th greater portion of them, together with their hoards treasures. As the citizens of London had aided in th revolution, they were pardoned for all the acts violence which had recently been committed in the "good city," and were rewarded with a new charter containing many and great privileges. As for th war in Guienne, which had been one of the instru ments by which Edward of Cærnarvon had bee ruined, that was soon over, a peace being concluded without difficulty by Charles the Fair and his nephew Edward the Third.

Yet at the very commencement of this reign there *was* war. It was brought about by the deposition of the king. The truce between England and Scotland had not yet expired, but Robert Bruce, considering that it was by this act of violence dissolved, and conceiving that it was a favourable opportunity of procuring a lasting and honourable peace, raised an army and prepared for an invasion. Early in February the Scots began to make inroads into England; and these forays were quickly succeeded by the march of regular armies. Bruce summoned his vassals from all parts—from the Lowlands, the Highlands, and the Isles—and twenty-five thousand men assembled on the banks of the Tweed to revenge their recent wrongs and cruel sufferings. Of this host about four thousand were well armed and well mounted, the rest rode upon mountain ponies and galloways, which could subsist upon the coarsest fare, and support almost any amount of fatigue. It was a force well adapted for sudden attack and rapid retreat. As Bruce was now growing old, and in declining health, the command of this force was intrusted to Randolph earl of Moray and the Lord James Douglas. On it came, like a whirlwind. The Tweed was crossed, and the Scots marched through Northumberland and Durham into the richer county of York in triumph. As these sons of "the mist and the mountain" passed along, villages and open towns were sacked and burned; and as for the beeves which fell into their hands, they were so numerous that they did not know what to do with them. Alarm spread throughout England. An army of sixty thousand or more gathered round the standard of young Edward. He was considered too young to govern the kingdom, but not too young to war for its defence. It is said that his martial spirit had already declared itself; but as the cause of his father's death had become whispered abroad, it is probable that Mortimer had suggested his going to war with the Scots to get him at a distance from the court. His presence there might have caused embarrassment to Queen Isabella and her "gentle Mortimer." On reaching York the movements of Edward were retarded by a quarrel between the English archers and the troops of John of Hainault, in which lives were lost on both sides. This quarrel being composed, young Edward marched forward. He reached Durham, following the course of the invaders by the smoke of the desolating fires which had marked the progress of the Scots. Encumbered with

vast camp equipage, the army of the English passed over marshes and savage deserts, mountains and dales, but no enemy was seen; the Scots had escaped over the mountains and moors of Westmoreland and Cumberland. It was now decided in a council of war that Edward should move northward in a straight line, and crossing the Tyne, occupy the roads between that river and the Tweed. Leaving behind them their baggage of stores and provisions, each horseman carrying only a single loaf, that movement was executed with rapidity. The Tyne was crossed, but the country was found to be so utterly wasted that they could find neither forage nor provisions sufficient for their wants. For seven days they waited for the enemy, whom they expected would cross the Tyne by the same ford on their return to Scotland. But they waited in vain, the Scots came not. The English army now retraced their steps towards the south, half famished, and perplexed as to where the Scots had taken up their position. At length Edward proclaimed a heritage worth a hundred pounds a year, together with the honours of knighthood, to any one who would bring him certain information of the situation of the Scottish army. The prize was won by Thomas de Rokesby. They were found by him encamped on a hill not more than three leagues off. That hill was on the right bank of the Wear, and Edward led his army to its left bank, opposite the Scots. The two armies ranged in order of battle, but there was no fighting. Some of the lords brought the young king on horseback before his forces in order to inspire them with courage, but they had no opportunity of displaying their valour. The river was rapid and dangerous to pass in the face of an enemy, and the Scots would not cross to meet the English, and the English would not cross to encounter the Scots. The young king offered them an undisturbed passage if they would come and fight in a fair and open field, but the Scots were not so chivalrously inclined. They would abide on the hills, they said, as long as they pleased. For three days the two armies lay in sight of each other, but on the morning of the fourth day, when the English looked upon the mountain, not a Scot was to be seen. Edward followed, and found them in a still more formidable position, higher up the river which still divided their forces. For eighteen days they lodged against each other: every night from dark till dawn, the Scots "horning with their horns, and making such a noise that it seemed as if all the great devils in hell were let loose." In the midst of this "horning," on one occasion, Douglas with two hundred followers, crossed the Wear, and with a loud cry of "A Douglas! a Douglas! ye shall die, ye English thieves!" fought their way to Edward's camp. They cut the cords of his camp asunder, and nearly captured the young king, and then fought their way back again. More than three hundred English were slain, and the Scots found their way back with but little loss. There was no more fighting. The Scots silently retired by a night march; and Edward, giving up the pursuit in despair, marched back to York, where his army was disbanded. The Scots returned to their own country laden with plunder. The young warrior was outgeneralled, and it is recorded that he wept when he found himself thus circumvented by an enemy inferior in numbers to his own forces.

On his return to London Edward breathed nothing but war and vengeance on the Scots. But he was not yet so much of a king as to make either peace or war. That power was in the hands of Queen Isabella and the Lord Mortimer. They had now other ends in view than the continuance of the war with the indomitable Scots. They were desirous of peace, and soon after they opened negotiations with Robert Bruce. On his part, Bruce was desirous of terminating the war by a definite and honourable treaty, a treaty which would secure peace to his country, and a throne to his young son David. A treaty of peace with Scotland was unpopular in England, but by the "evil and naughty counsel of the Lord Mortimer and the queen-mother," about the feast of Whitsuntide, A.D. 1328, a parliament, which met at Northampton, confirmed its articles. By this treaty the independence of Scotland was fully recognized, the long-contested point of feudal superiority being wholly given up. One of its leading articles was, that David, the only son of Robert Bruce, should be married to Joanna, a sister of King Edward, and notwithstanding their tender age, the ceremony was performed on the 22nd of July, at Berwick. It was also agreed that the Scotch regalia and "the stone of destiny" should be restored. In return for these and other advantages, Bruce agreed to pay thirty thousand marks for the damages caused by the recent invasion; and to restore to some English noblemen certain estates in Scotland.

While this treaty was pending, the youthful King Edward was married to Philippa of Hainault. She was brought over to England by her uncle John, a little before Christmas, A.D. 1327, and on the 24th of January following, the marriage ceremony was performed at York with great pomp.

At this period the position held by the Lord Mortimer exposed him to the envy of the barons. In a parliament held this year at Salisbury he was created earl of March, which had the two-fold effect of increasing his insolence and the animosity of his enemies. Dangers were gathering around both him and the queen-mother. After he had been created earl, the government seemed more than ever to be shared between him and Isabella. The regency became almost ciphers in the state. Mortimer's expenses grew with his exaltation. The right of purveyance was abused to meet his wants. Provisions were taken up by him in the ex-queen's name "at the king's price," to the sore oppression of the people. Such a state of things could not long continue. A confederacy was formed against him and Isabella. Those who had joined with them in dethroning Edward of Cærnarvon, now conspired against them. The confederates were Henry, earl of Lancaster, who was nominally at the head of the regency, and the late king's brothers, the earls of Kent and Norfolk. Other barons joined their cause. At a meeting held in London it was resolved to call Mortimer to an account for the murder of the late king; for depriving the regency of their authority; for embezzling the public treasure; for what was deemed the dishonourable peace with Scotland; and for various other crimes. For a time, however, Mortimer averted the danger

The confederates were irresolute. By the advice of some of the prelates, the earls of Kent and Norfolk made their peace with him and Isabella, and the earl of Lancaster, after making an ineffectual attempt to crush the favourite by force of arms, was compelled to sue for pardon and pay a heavy fine. Mortimer was a man of great subtlety, and withal revengeful. He had made peace with the king's uncles, but his reconciliation with them was insincere. He resolved to encompass their deaths. He began with the earl of Kent, who was young and artless. Mortimer's spies and agents persuaded him that Edward of Cærnarvon was still alive, and confined in Corfe Castle. He fell into the



CORFE CASTLE.

snare. The governor of that castle was in the secret, and confirmed the tale. The earl of Kent desired to see his brother Edward, but he could not, he said, let him have the desired interview. If he would write a letter, he would deliver it to him. That letter was written, and given to the governor, who forwarded it to the treacherous Mortimer. It contained a promise that he would exert all his power and influence to set his brother at liberty, and restore him to the throne. Nothing could be more natural, for if the earl believed that Edward of Cærnarvon was still alive, he would only be acting the part of a brother to take up his cause. But Edward was dead, and Mortimer knew it, and yet that fatal letter was considered treason! Isabella and Mortimer summoned a parliament comprised of their partisans, who adjudged the unfortunate victim to die as a traitor. The earl of Kent was beheaded outside the town of Winchester, and as no one could be found that would perform the office of headsman, a convicted felon was induced to wield the axe on condition of a free pardon. The trial which sent the credulous earl of Kent to the block for having designed to raise a dead man to the throne, is one of the most curious in the annals of jurisprudence. No other crime was laid to his charge. It is recorded, however, that his death was the less lamented because his servants and retinue had been accustomed to ride abroad and take things up at their pleasure, neither paying nor agreeing to pay their owners for them, proof that the oppressive privileges of purveyance were still a part of the ways and means, not only of royalty, but of the nobles of the land.

Mortimer did not long triumph after this scene of iniquity. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is the decree of heaven. About three months after the death of the earl of Kent, King Edward became a father. In June, A.D. 1330, his first-born, Edward, known to posterity as the Black Prince, was born at Woodstock. The young king was then eighteen years of age, and he thought, and rightly so, that it was time to assert his royal authority, and emancipate himself from the yoke of the queen-mother and the Lord Mortimer, especially as their rule was hateful to his people. The immorality of their connection had long been the theme of the popular outcry. It was a scandal to the nation. Their actions, also, had aroused the popular indignation, and there was a cry for vengeance. Edward himself had both reason to fear and hate the Lord Mortimer. But how to encompass his downfal was the question. His power was formidable, and it required great circumspection on the part of the king to carry out his design. There were, however, willing hearts and ready hands among his nobles to aid him, and the plan for getting rid of Mortimer was soon settled. It was not an age when men scrupled to do acts of treachery and violence, and Mortimer had himself set the king and his barons the example. In the month of October there was a parliament held at Nottingham. Isabella and Mortimer took up their residence in the castle. They had a strong guard of armed knights, and the ex-queen slept every night with the keys of the castle under her pillow. On the king's arrival he was allowed with a few attendants to take up his abode within its walls, but his retinue chiefly lodged in the town. Lord Montacute was in the secret. On the morning of the 19th of October Edward and Montacute had a private interview, and immediately after, the noble lord rode away into the country with many attendants. Mortimer suspected treachery. Probably some hint of the plot had been given him. In the afternoon, Mortimer accused Edward before the council of being privy to a conspiracy against himself and the queen-mother, and though the king flatly denied it, he still adhered to the charge. He treated Edward as a liar. Still Mortimer considered himself safe in the castle. His knights were devoted to his interests, and the keys of the castle were in Isabella's custody; what harm could happen? But no keys were needed. On the west side of the sandstone rock on which the castle stands, there was, and still is, an entrance to a subterraneous passage which led to the interior of the castle. That entrance is still known as "Mortimer's hole." It was then covered over by brambles and bushes, but the governor of the castle had been won over, and he pointed it out to Edward and Montacute. In the dead of the night, therefore, Montacute and his attendants returned from their trip into the country.

nade their way through this secret passage. . they were within the castle walls and had d the foot of the main tower, they were joined king, who led them up a silent staircase into a apartment. While there, voices were heard in ueen's apartment. Isabella and Mortimer with ishop of Lincoln and others were spending the hours of the night in anxious consultation. further mischief they were brooding over was reserved for the page of history, for they were ort in their deliberations. After killing two s, the intruders rushed into the room, and it vain that Isabella entreated her "sweet son" e her "gentle Mortimer;" he was dragged out castle and committed to safe custody. Mor- with several of his adherents, were sent under g guard, to the Tower of London, and Edward a proclamation, in which he announced that he ken the administration of the government, had been "evil managed," into his own hands; at he had caused the earl of March and his nts to be arrested as the principal movers of il management. Mortimer was condemned as r by a parliament held at Westminster on the f November. The charges on which he was ed were, that he had fomented dissensions n the late king and queen; that he had caused d II. to be murdered; that he had compelled rl of Lancaster and others to pay heavy fines; e had illegally assumed the powers of the r; and that he had encompassed the death of rl of Kent. He was hanged at "the elms," yburn, on the 29th of November. Sir Simon rd was executed with him as an accomplice. were afterwards condemned and executed. y, one of the murderers of Edward of Cærnar- whose head, as well as that of Ogle, a price t by parliament, was arrested in Spain, and ed over to an English officer, who, under pri- structions, beheaded him at sea without any trial. What became of Ogle is not known. the "she-wolf" of France, Queen Isabella—one most guilty of all who had figured in this era ie and retribution—at the intercession of the ier shame and guilt escaped exposure and nent, but she passed the remaining twenty- ears of her life in seclusion at her house at

ard III. was now his own master, and a new ommenced. The era of misrule was over. A ielded the sceptre who was able to govern his

There was no longer to be anarchy in the awless force must yield to kingly authority. vantages of his administration soon became t. The numerous gangs of robbers which had twenty years of revolution and counter-revolu- sted the land, were hunted down and brought ce. Even the barons, who had been their rs, if not abettors, no longer had the power to hem from punishment. There were no longer us favourites at court. There was wide-spread on when, one after the other, Gaveston, the ers, and Mortimer had fallen, their deaths onsidered a just punishment for the wrongs d committed on the body politic. Edward III. wisely kept his court free from minions, and chose able men for his counsellors, and learned and just men to administer the laws. New life and vigour were infused by his rule into all parts of the constitution.

But though Edward III. was gifted with many of the qualities of a sagacious ruler, his reign unhappily was not of a peaceful character. His mind, as his after history will disclose, was tainted with the common vice of most great rulers, ambition. But if Edward was ambitious, so were the chief men of his kingdom. They went with him heart and soul in all his enterprises. They copied his martial ardour and chivalrous accomplishments. They were proud to follow him to fields of "glory won by blood." His wars were often founded on doubtful pretensions, but their justice was never called into question. It was under his rule that the character of the English became fully unfolded. Then it was really made manifest that a great race had sprung out of the Norman oppressor and the Saxon serf; that their blood, mingled with that of the "bold Britons" and their Roman masters, had at length produced a nation inferior to none either of ancient or modern times. "Every yeoman from Kent to Northumberland valued himself as one of a race born for victory and dominion," even as did the Romans of old. Hence it was that the annals of this reign chiefly consist of relations of gorgeous pageants of chivalry; the tramp of war-horses with their stately trappings; and the gallantry of mail-clad riders in the tournament and battle-field, accompanied by scenes of desolation, the ruin of domestic comfort by arresting the pursuits of industry; and the slaughter of tens of thousands.

The general feeling of the nation had been averse to the late treaty with Scotland; and no one had been more averse to it than King Edward. His pride had been wounded by it, and he longed to wipe out the disgrace he had incurred in the first campaign of his warlike career. At this time Robert Bruce was dead, and his son David sat on his throne. Scotland had also lost two of its bravest warriors. The Lord James Douglas had been killed in Spain as he was conveying the heart of Bruce to the Holy Land; and Randolph earl of Moray and regent of the kingdom, died suddenly in July A.D. 1332. Randolph was succeeded in the regency by Donald earl of Marr; a man far inferior to him in prudence and ability. It has been seen that by one of the articles in the late treaty some English noblemen were to be restored to their estates in Scotland. That stipulation had been disregarded. It was in vain that remonstrances were made by the English court and the nobles interested; with the exception of Henry de Percy, not one recovered their own. Under these circumstances the disappointed nobles formed a design of bringing about a change in the Scottish dynasty. Edward Baliol was living on his ancestral estates in France, and he was invited by them to come and take possession of the kingdom of which his father John Baliol had been deprived. He had promises of warm support, and Baliol accepted the invitation. He came to the north of England with forty knights, where he was joined by the discontented lords, among whom were the earls of Athol and Angus, and the lords Beaumont, Wake, and

Warenne. They had raised an army of two thousand five hundred men to support the cause of Baliol, the chief of whom were English, but some were disaffected Scots. King Edward issued a proclamation prohibiting the passage of armed men through the northern counties, but it is supposed—and that with good reason—that he secretly encouraged the movement. At all events they *did* march through those counties to the Humber, whence they sailed to Fife, where they landed in August. The success of Baliol was rapid and marvellous. On his landing he dispersed a crowd of country people who had assembled to oppose him; and in a few days he twice defeated an army of Scots under the earl of Marr, and each time with great slaughter. Among the slain were the earls of Marr, Carrick, and Monteith, and several other men of note, and the whole kingdom was thrown into consternation. David and his young queen were sent into France for safety. Baliol, following up his successes, took Perth without resistance; and on the 27th of September he was crowned king of Scotland at Scone.

But Baliol's reverse of fortune was as rapid as his success had been. When Edward III. received the news of this revolution in Scotland, he was holding a parliament. He was advised by that assembly to march with an army to the north, to watch events. While on his route Baliol secretly renewed to him all the forms of feudal submission imposed on his father by Edward I.; engaging to deliver Berwick into his hands, and to marry Joanna his sister, if her marriage with David Bruce, his rival, could be dissolved. Baliol considered that he was firmly seated on the throne of Scotland; and in his fancied security he dismissed his troops, and went to spend his Christmas at Annan in Dumfriesshire. But the Scots were not yet subjected to Baliol's sway. The name of Bruce was dear to them, while that of Baliol was held in scorn. In the dead of the night he was suddenly attacked by a body of horse under Sir Archibald Douglas, young Randolph, earl of Moray, and Sir Simon Frazer, and he was compelled to fly for his life. Leaving his brother Henry dead behind him, he himself, half-naked, escaped on horseback, without a saddle, to Carlisle.

It was felt, if not actually known, that the English king had secretly countenanced Baliol's expedition, and the greatest exasperation prevailed among the adherents of King David. Acting in his name, but without orders, early in A.D. 1333, the Scots invaded England, fire and slaughter waiting on their steps. Before this irruption, Edward had applied to his parliament to legalize, or at least to justify in the eyes of the English, his ambitious projects on Scotland, but the prelates, barons, and commons were divided in their opinion, and gave no direct advice on the subject. When, however, the Scots had renewed their depredations on English ground, parliament engaged to assist him to the utmost. Their advice then was to recover Berwick and reduce Scotland. Edward was not slow in following this advice. It was in accordance with his heart's desire, and accordingly his military vassals were summoned to meet on the 2nd of May, at Newcastle. In that month a great army invested Berwick on all sides. Berwick had a numerous garrison, who made a vigorous defence; but on the 16th of July its governor, Sir William Keith, was compelled to treat, and promise that if it was not relieved by the 20th of that month at sun-rising, he would surrender. He was expecting relief from Lord Archibald Douglas, now acting as regent of Scotland for King David; and on the 19th, Douglas came with a numerous army. As he came in sight of Berwick, he found Edward's main army drawn up on Halidon Hill, about a mile north-west of the town. The hill was in part surrounded by bogs and marshes, yet Douglas resolved to attack the English in that advantageous position. It was in vain. As the Scots moved through the bogs, the English archers sorely galled them, and though when they gained the hard ground they rushed up the hill and made a fearful onslaught, which for the moment promised victory, the English repelled the attack. Douglas and many lords and chiefs of clans were slain, and then the Scots fell into confusion and fled in dismay. They were pursued by Edward at the head of the English cavalry, and by the Lord Darcy with a horde of Irish Kerns as auxiliaries; and for several miles there was fearful slaughter among the fugitives. Old writers record that Scotland had never sustained such a signal defeat, or witnessed such slaughter.

Berwick surrendered to King Edward, and he restored Baliol to his dishonoured throne. Edward returned to England, leaving an army of twenty-six thousand men, English and Irish, to support his authority. There was no more fighting during this year, for Baliol met with no further opposition. In a parliament held during the autumn at Perth, his right to the crown of Scotland was distinctly recognized. Had he acted wisely he might have retained it, but his subservience to King Edward outraged the national feeling. Not only did he do homage in person at Newcastle, in June, A.D. 1334, for his kingdom, but he ceded a large portion of the south of that kingdom to England. The shires of Edinburgh, Roxburgh, Selkirk, Dumfries, Peebles, Haddington, and Linlithgow, with all their towns and castles, were to be for ever united to the crown, and incorporated with the kingdom of England. These were the most valuable of the provinces of Scotland, and such a concession raised a storm of indignation against Baliol. He was looked upon as the shadow of a king, and as a mere tool in the hands of the English monarch. Even many of his former partisans forsook his cause from sheer disgust. Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, who had been regent of Scotland for David Bruce, raised an army, and despite the forces which Edward had left for his defence, Baliol was once more driven from his throne across the borders. The Scots sent ambassadors to France to implore the assistance of Philip de Valois, who had, on the death of Charles the Fair, succeeded to the French throne. Philip had hospitably entertained King David and his young queen, and it was hoped that he would send troops to aid in restoring him to his kingdom. On the other hand, Edward reinforced Baliol, who was in the south, where he maintained himself among the English garrisons. In the year 1335 Edward joined his forces with those of Baliol, at Perth, he having advanced thither along the western coast of Scotland, and Baliol from Berwick by the eastern. As they had

not met with any stern resistance, it was thought that the Scots were finally subdued; but no sooner had Edward re-entered England than Baliol was again attacked from all quarters, and compelled to act on the defensive. During the first months of A.D. 1336 hostilities were suspended by a truce procured by the agents of the Pope and Philip of France. A congress was held at Newcastle for negociating a peace, but without effect. The truce expired on the 9th of May, and the war was renewed. Edward again led an army into Scotland. As the Scottish patriots had not received effectual assistance from France, they took refuge in their inaccessible mountains and wilds, leaving all the level country a defenceless prey. Edward marched through Athol to Inverness, marking his way with desolation, and returning in the same manner by the sea-coasts, he burnt the city of Aberdeen. He came again to Perth, and leaving his brother John and part of his army with Baliol, he returned to England. In the autumn he held a parliament at Nottingham, and he was still there when he heard of the death of his brother John, and of some hostile enterprises of the Scots. Again he flew to the relief of his mean-spirited ally, but with the same result as before. The Scots flew to their mountains and wilds, and Edward, after desolating other parts of the country, returned to London to keep his Christmas. Supported by the English monarch, Baliol for some time supported the semblance of authority in the Lowlands, but when Edward was compelled to suspend his warlike operations by a war which he was about to undertake in France, he was a third time driven ignominiously from his throne. While Edward was engaged in actual war with France in A.D. 1338, castle after castle was taken by the Scots, and Baliol took refuge in England. Three years after, King David, who was then eighteen years of age, returned with his queen to Scotland, where he was received with enthusiasm. He was in alliance with the king of France, and as Edward was still at war with that monarch, in the year 1342 David made several inroads into England. Edward was, indeed, glad to conclude a truce with him—a truce which was prolonged to the end of A.D. 1344. Meanwhile that "shadow of a king," Baliol, was provided for by his patron, Edward, in the north of England, where he was employed to protect that part of the country from the forays of Scottish borderers.

Philip, king of France, had promised assistance to the Scots, and was known to be making great preparations for that purpose. Philip dreaded the martial and ambitious spirit of the English king, and he conceived that by joining his forces to those of the Scottish patriots, he might restrain his ambition. But while Philip was meditating attacking Edward in the desolated plains of Scotland, Edward was meditating attacking him in the fertile plains of France. A wilder dream of ambition than that of establishing his authority over Scotland by means of the mean-spirited Edward Baliol had taken possession of his mind—that of annexing the whole French kingdom to his dominions. As the claim which he put forth to that crown was the source of long and bloody wars between England and France, it is necessary to explain the foundation on which it was built.

Charles the Fair had died without male issue, and was succeeded by his cousin Philip de Valois. In the year 1329 Philip had summoned Edward to come over to France to pay him homage as his liege lord for his French dominions. It is said that Edward *then* considered the crown of France was his by right, and that it was with great reluctance he obeyed the summons. It is further said that before he *did* obey it he made a protestation before his own council that what he did was by constraint, and should not be considered as a renunciation of his right to the crown of France. Who constrained him? Was it his "own council?" If so, it may be presumed that they considered his claim chimerical. However, as the story goes, he went and did homage to Philip for his French dominions; but as he looked on the beauty and riches of France, he became more than ever resolved to assert his claim to that fair kingdom. But what was the nature of the claim which Edward pretended to have to the throne of France? It rested upon these shallow grounds. By a law of France called the Salic law, females were excluded from its throne. No female had ever filled that throne, although the monarchy had existed for nine centuries. The law was unwritten, and was in principle ill-defined, but it was the established custom; and long-established custom takes the force of law. By that custom, or law, the daughters of several of the ancient kings of France had been excluded from the succession. In virtue of it, the two immediate predecessors of Philip de Valois—Philip the Long and Charles the Fair—had succeeded to the crown. Charles the Fair died A.D. 1328, leaving a daughter, Maria, and a queen *enceinte*. Here this famous and fatal controversy commences. It was concerning the right to the regency till the queen was delivered, and to the succession if the child proved to be a daughter. There were two claimants, Philip de Valois, *brother* to Philip the Fair; and Edward III., king of England, son of Isabella, *daughter* of Philip the Fair. This great cause was solemnly debated before an assembly of the states of France, the only competent judges in the matter, and it was decided in favour of Philip de Valois. He became regent till it should appear whether the child was a son or daughter. When born it proved to be a daughter, and then Philip, according to the decision of the states, became king. As before seen, Edward went to France to do homage to Philip for his French dominions. He also performed several other acts expressive of his acknowledgment of Philip's right and title to the French kingdom. If he had not been satisfied with the decision of the states of France, he ought never to have performed that homage, or done those acts, for by so doing he virtually set aside his own claim. But it is said that he was not satisfied, and that he had all along meditated putting in a claim for the crown which had been awarded to Philip. His ambition, therefore, had long been smouldering in his bosom, and it is possible that it would have smouldered still longer but for the favour which Philip showed towards the Scots. He had afforded an asylum to their young king and queen; he had sent them small supplies of men and money, and had openly encouraged their partisans; and at length he was making preparations to give them his

powerful aid. Incensed at this, Edward resolved to revive his claim to the crown of France, and to win it if he could by the sword. In this resolve he was encouraged and confirmed by Robert d'Artois, a brother-in-law of Philip de Valois, who had recently taken refuge in the English court. Robert d'Artois had some years before maintained a law-suit for the county of Artois, which, by a sentence of Charles the Fair, A.D. 1309, had been adjudged to his rival. This sentence, when his brother-in-law became king, he hoped to get reversed. Unfortunately, however, Philip was privy to the forging of certain deeds for strengthening his title to this disputed territory, and instead of reversing the sentence, he banished Robert d'Artois, and confiscated all his estates. It was from this circumstance that he had taken refuge in England; and in the hope of recovering his lost honours and estates, he laboured earnestly to persuade Edward that his title to the crown of France was valid. As the whisperings of Robert d'Artois were in accordance with the suggestions of Edward's ambition, and as Philip had so greatly offended him by his support of the Scottish patriots, he resolved to attempt the acquisition of France. In the year 1336 he declared that the peers of France and the states-general had acted rather "like villains and robbers" than upright judges; and that he would no longer submit to their decision, or recognize Philip as king of the French. This declaration was followed by action. In A.D. 1337 he sent over a commission to the earl of Brabant and others, to demand the kingdom of France as his indisputable right; and this demand being rejected with scorn, he prepared for war.

Edward's enterprise was one of great difficulty. France was not a kingdom to be won by a single battle, or without great armies. All this was known to him, and he prepared accordingly. His preparations, for the age, were on a gigantic scale. In making them he had the hearty assistance of the English people. War with France was universally popular in England, and it was felt that if any one could conquer it, it was the chivalrous King Edward. Hence he had no great difficulty in raising the ways and means. His parliament readily granted him subsidies; and his subjects willingly submitted to tallages. The heart of the nation was with him. He seized all the wool of the year throughout the kingdom, and the tin in Cornwall and Devonshire; and yet no complaints were heard. But if his subjects submitted to privations in aid of the enterprise, so did the king himself. In the hope of obtaining the crown of France, he pawned the jewels of that which adorned his brows. The money he collected was enormous, but it was not more than was needed. He had not only to support his own army, but to subsidize allies on the Continent: allies in whom he could not place implicit trust. Among these were the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, the dukes of Brabant and Guilders, the archbishop of Cologne, the marquis of Juliers, the counts of Hainault and Namur, the lords of Tanquemont and Bacquen. All these, with others, eagerly received money from the English monarch, but they proved not to be so eager to do battle for him. One continental earl proved incorruptible, the earl of Flanders. Edward courted his alliance by the most tempting offers, but he continued steady and warm in his attachment to King Philip. The earl of Flanders, however, had recently lost much of his authority over his subjects. The democratic party in Flanders had triumphed over the nobles, and the inhabitants of the great trading cities had placed themselves under the government of James Von Artaveldt, a rich brewer of Ghent. The brewer Artaveldt was possessed of more than sovereign authority in Flanders; and by his influence its rich and populous cities were induced to invite the English king to land his army in their territories.

Edward sailed from Orwell in Suffolk in July, A.D. 1338. He landed at Antwerp, and was warmly received by the Flemings. But there was no war in that year. It was spent in inactivity. After granting various trading privileges to the Flemings and Brabanters, and spending his money among the Germans, all that he could procure from them was a promise to meet him in July, A.D. 1339. But they were not then ready. It was September before he could take the field, and then fifty thousand men followed him to the siege of Cambray. As he approached the confines of France, the counts of Namur and Hainault refused to advance further, and retired with their forces. They had rendered him service enough for their money; and Edward, ironically thanking them for what they had done, they returned to their homes. He had still an army of forty-seven thousand men-at-arms, and with these he advanced to Peronne and St. Quentin, burning all the villages and open towns in his route. Here the rest of his allies retired from the contest. He had spent his money in vain. To pay his allies, indeed, he had not only spent his all, but had contracted a heavy debt; and as Philip avoided a battle, merely acting on the defensive, Edward was obliged to retire to Ghent. All that was done in this campaign was to inflict ruin on unoffending French citizens and peasants. About this time Pope Benedict XII. made an attempt to restore peace; but Edward would not listen to any terms short of being put into possession of the French kingdom. On the contrary, he assumed the dangerous title of king of France, and quartered the French lilies with the English lions in his arms.

Edward had solemnly engaged with his allies not to return to England till the war was ended. But necessity knows no law. In the year 1340 he was compelled to return to obtain fresh resources. He left his queen and infant son, Lionel, with four earls at Antwerp, as hostages for his return within a week after Midsummer. He landed at Harwich on the 21st of February, and in March he held a parliament. There was no great difficulty in procuring the supplies he needed. Having represented that without a large supply all his designs would be ruined, and himself dishonoured, and that he was obliged to return to the Continent, and to stay there till all the debts he had contracted were liquidated, the parliament still sharing in his madness, liberally responded to his demands. The barons and knights granted him the ninth sheaf, fleece, and lamb of all their lands for two years; and the citizens and burgesses a ninth of their moveables according to their real value, besides cheerfully submitting to additional customs on various

of merchandize. Even the clergy subse-
granted a tenth of their revenues for three
e whole community still deeming the prize in
rth the greatest sacrifices they could make.
ame time Edward made some return for their
nerosity, for he remitted some old debts, and
hed the feudal aid for knighting his eldest
the marriage dower of his eldest daughter.
g obtained a present supply by borrowing
ns from his richer subjects, Edward prepared
n to Flanders. Before he embarked he re-
nformation that Philip had collected a large
the harbour of Sluys, at the mouth of the
to intercept his passage. Here was an oppor-
r a battle, and perhaps a victory at sea. He
atient to fight that naval battle. His council
him to increase his fleet, but he sailed with the
it were ready to encounter this great French
it. He sailed from Orwell on the 22nd of
d on the following evening he came in sight
nemy. So numerous were their ships that
t says, "their masts seemed to be like a great
On the morning of the 24th the French drew
he mouth of the harbour to meet the English.



SHIP, TIME OF EDWARD III.

e grace of God and St. George," exclaimed
as he witnessed this movement, "I shall now,
e desired, fight with the Frenchman." And
ght. There was a terrible battle, a hand-to-
nflict, in which the English archers did terri-
ution. The first success was the recapture of
ty ship," the 'Christopher,' which the English
the year before; the final result was the
ion or capture of nearly the whole of the
fleet. From ten to fifteen thousand French
s were either killed or drowned. So complete
victory, that none of Philip's courtiers or
s dared to apprise him of the event. That
s left to his buffoon. "The English," said the
'are rank cowards." "Why so?" demanded
"Because," replied the fool, "they had not
rage to jump overboard, like your Majesty's
and Norman mariners did at Sluys."
ssue of this naval victory was advantageous to Edward both at home and abroad. His parliament hastened their supplies to enable him to follow up his success; and his allies now flocked to his standard. But although he had won this great victory "by heavenly grace and mercy," fortune again proved fickle. It is said that two hundred thousand men followed him to the French frontier, but no more laurels were won this year. The Flemings under Robert d'Artois were defeated while besieging St. Omers, and all Edward's efforts to capture Tournay, one of the richest and most populous cities of Flanders, and zealously attached to the French interests, proved fruitless.

While the siege of Tournay was progressing, Philip remained at some distance with a powerful army; and, as he would not approach to do battle, Edward conceived a romantic idea to bring the quarrel to an issue. As if this great contest was a wager of battle in which heaven would decide the right, he sent a letter to "Philip of Valois," offering, in order "to prevent the mortality amongst Christians," as the quarrel was between themselves, to meet him in single combat; or, if that mode of settling it did not suit his views, then the dispute might be ended by the battle of one hundred of the most valiant knights on the French side, and as many of his, King Edward's, liege subjects. But Philip did not choose to risk his crown in such a chivalrous manner. He coolly replied that he had seen a letter addressed to one "Philip of Valois," but as it did not come to him he should return no answer; but as soon as he should think fit, he would drive out of his kingdom those who had dared to enter it in arms. Philip also reproached Edward with the violation of his oath of homage and rebellion against his liege lord. Edward could do nothing. Philip would neither fight nor fly; and, as his allies were again hourly deserting him, he was compelled to agree to an armistice. Commissioners were appointed to treat of an accommodation, and a truce was concluded, which was first to last till the 25th of June, A.D. 1341, and was afterwards prolonged till the same date, A.D. 1342. In the interval, the Pope endeavoured to convert the truce into a lasting peace; but this time Philip would not listen to the Holy Father. Unless his rival, he said, struck the lilies out of his arms, and gave up his assumed title of king of France, he would not treat with him. So there was only a pause in the strife: the war was not ended.

Edward retired from Tournay chagrined, and in a wrathful mood. His allies had again deceived him; but he could not punish them. Still burning with anger he returned to England. Late in November he suddenly appeared at the Tower of London. No one expected him, and there were signs of culpable negligence in that fortress. Its gates and walls were unguarded. If Edward could not punish his allies, it was soon seen that he could punish his subjects. On their heads his pent-up wrath descended. The first storm of his indignation fell upon those who had the custody of the Tower; they were imprisoned. The next morning he threw three of the judges into prison, dismissed the lord chancellor, the treasurer, and the master of the rolls, and ordered the arrest of several officers who had been employed in collecting the revenue. Anger had got the master of him. They had

all aided him in his designs, but no one had done their duty. In his present temper no one was safe, for anger is a short madness. Stratford, the archbishop of Canterbury, who was president of the Council of Ministers, had greatly promoted the war with France, and fearing the wrath of the king, fled to Canterbury. All—from the highest officer in the state to the lowest—had fallen under suspicion of doing wrong during his absence. Stratford was summoned to appear before the king, but he refused. He appealed for himself and colleagues to the protection of Magna Charta, and resorted to the old system of excommunicating all such as should violate its provisions and the liberties of the subject by arbitrary arrests: he would only, he said, be tried by his peers. In the first outburst of his wrath, Edward had imprisoned several of the sacerdotal order, and Stratford wrote to all the bishops of his province, commanding them to publish excommunication against all who violated the immunities of the Church by imprisoning the clergy. Edward and his council feared that he would become a second Thomas à Becket; but in the end this contest proved harmless. In order to deprive Stratford of such popularity, he was charged in the king's name with appropriating, or irregularly applying, to other purposes the supplies voted by parliament for the king's use. Stratford replied, by a circular letter, that such a charge was a libel; that the taxes raised were mortgaged for the payment of debts contracted by the king in the year preceding. The contest grew warm: in his reply, the king exhibited passion, clearly showing that he had the worst of the argument. In truth, on this occasion the mitre beat the crown on constitutional grounds, and the king and the archbishop became reconciled. It is, however, probable that Edward's want of money may have had something to do with the peaceful settlement of this quarrel, for at this time neither the parliament nor the people were inclined to give it ungrudgingly. It would have been unwise for the king to have continued it, for the clergy had still great power in the state, and the people were not disposed to submit to the rule of an arbitrary monarch. Parliament, indeed, would not on this occasion grant him the aid he required for the further prosecution of the war with France without an equivalent: that is, a reform of the past, and a guarantee against future abuses—another instance of a wise barter for the liberties of England.

Edward's scheme of conquering France, chiefly by means of mercenary allies, had signally failed. They had never felt any vital interest in his cause, or really desired its success. All they wanted was his gold, and when his coffers were empty they deserted his standard. He was now about to try the effect of the arms of the native English, without placing any confidence in mercenaries. He had begun to despair. His losses had hitherto been greater than his gains. He had lost almost all his conquests in Scotland; had greatly impoverished England; had stripped himself of his diadem, and his queen of her jewels; and had contracted a heavy load of debt, which was daily increasing by a high rate of interest, and as yet he had made no progress in his design. All he had to set against this was a naval victory at Sluys, which brought him nothing but empty glory. All his efforts to induce his rival to meet him had hither proved fruitless. Under these circumstances, ther fore, it is no wonder that he had been wrathful, a that he was on the verge of despair. At this junctu however—A.D. 1341—an event happened which r vived his hopes.

That event was another disputed succession, a di pute which occasioned the early renewal of hostilitie John III., duke of Brittany, died without issue. H next brother, Guy, had died some years before, lea ing an only daughter, Jane, who was married t Charles de Blois, nephew of the French king. Hi half-brother, John de Montfort, was still living, and dispute arose between the uncle and the niece, eac claiming the duchy by right of inheritance. Th uncle was the more active and the more popular o the two competitors. He took possession of the deceased duke's treasures, got himself acknowledged by most of the prelates and nobles, obtained possession of the chief fortresses, and then crossed over to England to obtain the co-operation of King Edward. On the other hand, Charles de Blois went to Paris with his wife, and threw himself upon the protection of Philip. The French king convoked a court of peers to try this great cause, and John de Montfort was summoned to attend to show his title to the duchy of Brittany. That summons was imprudently obeyed. He went, accompanied by four hundred gentlemen of Brittany, and the cause was learnedly discussed on both sides. On the part of the uncle it was urged that, as Brittany was a fief of France, the Salic law, excluding females, was the law of the duchy; that he was nearer in blood to the late duke, his half-brother, than Jane, who was only the offspring of another brother; and that females were incapacitated according to all philosophers, both heathen and Christian, from dignities both in spiritual and temporal government. On the part of the niece it was argued that she was the last branch of the elder family, and, therefore, had all the rights of the father; that it was on record that females had repeatedly inherited the duchy; and that, therefore, her sex did not preclude her from the inheritance. It is quite clear that the Salic law did not apply to Brittany. Guy, the father of Jane, had obtained the consent of the states of Brittany to her marriage with Charles de Blois, in order that she might have a husband who could, by his powerful connections, defend her rights, and because there was a prospect by such a union of the entire settlement of the succession. But it was not by argument that this cause was to be settled. Philip's mind was made up to defend the cause of the niece, and he demanded that De Montfort should immediately surrender the treasures of the late duke. This demand convinced him that the judgment of the French court would be against him, and, as Philip directed him not to leave Paris for fifteen days, fearing he should be arrested, he fled in disguise, and then judgment was given in favour of his opponent. De Montfort repaired to London, and there did homage to Edward for his duchy as lawful king of France; while, on the other hand, Charles de Blois did homage to Philip. Charles was supplied with a French force of six thousand men to make good his claim. His rival had returned from England without assistance, and threw himself upon the affec-

Bretons for support. Soon after de Mont-
al, however, Charles de Blois captured the
tes, and he himself was taken prisoner and
is, where he was shut up in the Tower of
.

de Blois flattered himself that the contest
De Montfort's captivity seemed at once to
to his pretensions to the duchy of Brittany,
all the hopes which the English king had
m his alliance to the ground. But there
an in Brittany who had "the courage of a
e heart of a lion." Roused by the captivity
and, and the impending ruin of her family,
s de Montfort assembled the inhabitants of
ere she then resided, and pleaded her cause
. Holding her infant son in her arms, she
heir assistance for the only male issue of
nt line of princes in strains at once bold
ıg; and when she found that her appeal
led to, she girded on her sword, put a steel
er head, and rode from castle to castle, and
to town, raising troops and commanding
a hardy knight." Her progress was one
. The Bretons everywhere ranged them-
r her banner; and she went and shut her-
he port of Hennebon to wait for the suc-
Edward had promised her husband.
before the English arrived the fair coun-
sieged by the French under Charles de
ırles pushed the siege with vigour, in the
ing her prisoner, but all his efforts were
nated by her heroism, the garrison and in-
epelled all his assaults. On one occasion,
l of three hundred horsemen, she cut her
h the besiegers, and five days after, having
nforcements, at sunrise, she dashed between
camp and the ramparts and got safe back
. The garrison did not know what had
he "brave lady," and when she re-entered,
the town there was a mighty clangour of
ıd horns, at which the French marvelled
arms. But at length there was a scarcity
s in Hennebon, and its walls had become
l by repeated assaults that the town was
enable. The countess and the garrison
spair. No succour appeared from England,
ılation was resolved upon. The bishop of
ıad incessantly urged this course as their
ɔm, was deputed to settle the terms with
uch was the decision of the lords of Brit-
her command; but the countess was as
d as ever. She urged them to hold out
longer, expressing her belief that within
succour would arrive from King Edward.
id. As on the morning of the day the lords
were about to capitulate, and the French
ring to take possession of the town, the
ıo was looking over the sea from a case-
ɔ tower of the castle, suddenly exclaimed
ırt of joy:—"No capitulation, the English
" She saw the English fleet just crossing
, and in a brief space of time its ships,
nall, sailed into the harbour, and landed a
ops under the command of Sir Walter
nnebon was soon relieved of the besiegers.

In a sortie, on the next day, commanded by Sir Walter, the great battering engine, which had long been hammering away at its walls, was destroyed, and many of the tents of the besiegers set on fire, for which good service, on his return to the town, the countess "came forth joyfully," and kissed him and his comrades two or three times "like a brave lady."

The siege of Hennebon was now raised, and the French carried the war into Lower Brittany. Several towns were captured; but at Quimperlé they were signally defeated by the English and the forces of the countess. Later in the season, Charles de Blois returned to the siege of Hennebon; but another brilliant sortie, headed by the brave Sir Walter Manny, put an end to this second siege, and the French retreated. The Countess de Montfort then—A.D. 1342—came to England to press for further reinforcements, and Edward furnished her with some troops, who were placed under the command of Robert d'Artois. Off Guernsey the vessels in which they were embarked were attacked by a French fleet, and there was a fierce combat, in which the English suffered some loss, but, favoured by the darkness of the night, they got safely into a port between Hennebon and Vannes. Robert d'Artois and the countess laid siege to Vannes, and captured it; but it was shortly after re-taken by the French, and Robert escaped with difficulty through a postern gate. He was sorely wounded, and he returned to England, where he died.

King Edward now resolved to take the command in Brittany. He sailed from Sandwich early in October with twelve thousand men, and landed his troops without opposition. Having established a siege at Vannes, he proceeded to Rennes, and from thence to Nantz, driving the French before him, and laying waste the country in his route. But Edward undertook too much at one time. By laying siege to Vannes, Rennes, and Nantz, his forces became divided, thereby weakening his strength. It was an error of which the French were not slow to take advantage. Charles de Blois was reinforced by Philip's eldest son, John duke of Normandy, and Edward retraced his steps to Vannes, where he entrenched himself. The French army consisted of forty thousand men, who completely surrounded Edward's small army in their entrenchments. His situation was critical. All the supplies he could obtain must have been derived from England, and contrary winds might have retarded them, or they might have been intercepted by the enemy's fleet. As the two armies, however, were thus facing each other, each fearing to come to an encounter, two legates arrived from the Pope, and by their good offices a truce was concluded, which was to exist from the 19th of January, A.D. 1343, to Michaelmas, A.D. 1346. This truce was confirmed with great solemnity by both kings and the chief nobility, all taking a solemn oath to observe it; and then Edward returned to England. But never was a truce less observed.

By one of its articles all prisoners on both sides were to be set at liberty. John de Montfort was expressly mentioned in that article of release; but in defiance of it, Philip kept him in still closer custody. It was in vain that even the Pope remonstrated with him on his faithlessness; he was only answered by

quibbles. So exasperated were the two nations against each other, that the French and English cared nothing for the armistice to which their kings had sworn. Every opportunity of coming to blows, whether by sea or land, was eagerly embraced. The Bretons, also, under their heroic countess, still defied the French, and the French still made no scruples in attacking the Bretons. There was universal animosity which no truce could curb. Mutual complaints were made of its violation, but neither party was willing to set an example of refraining from hostilities. Philip damaged his cause not only by retaining John de Montfort prisoner in the Louvre, but by wanton cruelties. At a tournament held in Paris, he caused Oliver de Clisson, Godfrey d'Harcourt, and twelve other knights, to be arrested and summarily beheaded in the market-place; and the head of De Clisson was sent by him to be stuck up on the walls of Nantes. Other nobles in Normandy and elsewhere were disposed of in the same brutal manner, the crimes alleged against them being that they carried on a treasonable correspondence with England. By this policy Philip raised up a host of enemies against both himself and Charles de Blois. Many noble Bretons who had supported the cause of Charles, went over to that of the heroic countess de Montfort. Brittany was finally lost to him through the ill-timed policy of Philip, on whose power he leaned for support.

On his return from the siege of Vannes, Edward consulted his parliament in April as to whether the truce which had been concluded should be followed by peace with France, or whether the war should be renewed. Both lords and commons approved of the truce, and advised the king to make peace if he could obtain it on reasonable terms; if not they promised him their hearty support in the maintenance of his quarrel. A commission was appointed to treat of peace with the commissioners of Philip, before the Pope at Avignon, as their mutual friend; and the holy father laboured earnestly to bring peace about, but in vain. The conferences were opened on the 22nd of October, and on the 29th of November they closed without effect. The quarrel between the two monarchs became fiercer and hotter than ever. They even indulged in unseemly personalities. Philip having recently established the monopoly of salt, Edward sarcastically remarked that he now, indeed, reigned by the Salic law; and Philip retorted by calling Edward the wool-merchant. Hard names were finally succeeded by blows.

As it was evident that the war would be renewed, both parties made great preparations. It was with this view that Edward, early in the year 1344, proclaimed a grand tournament to be celebrated at Windsor, that he might have an opportunity of engaging many brave knights in his service. In June he met his parliament at Westminster, in which a war spirit was strongly displayed. Having by his chancellor represented that Philip had violated the truce in no less than seven articles, and desired the advice of his lords and commons, they advised him to be no longer abused by ill-observed truces, but to prosecute the war with vigour, till he was enabled to obtain an honourable peace. This advice was seconded by the grant of liberal supplies. He was to have an aid of two-fifteenths from the counties, and two-tenths from the cities and burghs. The clergy of the province Canterbury also granted him the tenths of their livings for two years. Thus supported, Edward published a manifesto containing his reasons for renewing the war before the expiration of the truce; and followed it up by sending troops into Brittany to assist the countess de Montfort; and a still greater force into Guienne, under his cousin, Henry of Lancaster, to drive the French out of that province. Henry of Lancaster captured many towns during this year, and defeated a French army greatly superior in numbers to his own, after which he went into winter quarters at Bordeaux.

Early in the year 1345 the Pope made an effort for renewing the conferences for a peace; but Edward, having other ends now in view, refused his consent. About the same time the prisoner of the Louvre, John de Montfort, arrived in England. He had escaped from his prison-house in the disguise of a pedlar. Having renewed his homage to Edward as king of France, for his duchy, he returned with some English troops to support his cause. The heart of his "brave lady" was gladdened by his presence; but her joy was transitory. He died of a fever at Hennebon, in September: appointing by will Edward, king of England, guardian to his son. From that time the Bretons remained Edward's faithful allies; and their country became open to him either for advance or retreat, whether he carried the war into Normandy or Poitou.

The other ends which Edward had in view when he refused to consent to a renewal of conferences for peace, was the obtaining of the earldom of Flanders for his eldest son, recently created prince of Wales. James d'Artaveldt, the brewer of Ghent, was his fast friend, and through his influence he hoped to succeed. Accordingly, in July he sailed from Sandwich with his son and a splendid retinue, to treat with the deputies of the free cities of Flanders at Sluys, where he landed. In revenge for the earl of Flanders' faithful adherence to the cause of Philip, he endeavoured to persuade the Flemings to transfer their allegiance from him to his son, the prince of Wales. The sovereign brewer was there, and warmly seconded his extraordinary proposition; for it was extraordinary that Edward should have proposed that the Flemings should cast off their allegiance to the rightful heir of the earldom, and bestow it on a stranger, even though he was a prince, and the son of a great king. Nevertheless, the free cities of Ypres and Bruges favoured Edward's proposition. But not so did the citizens of Ghent. Their dissent was displayed in the most unequivocal manner. Although their great leader, James d'Artaveldt—for whose famous son Philip, Edward's queen had stood sponsor at the baptismal font—had by his rule raised Ghent and other towns to an unprecedented height of prosperity, his exertions for Edward on this occasion cost him his life. On his return to Ghent the citizens, who were wont to salute him cap in hand, turned their backs upon him. There was mischief afloat, and the great brewer perceiving it, hurried to his house and made fast its gates. But it was useless. The fury of the citizens was not to be baulked by bolts and bars. They stormed his house, and having taken it, and got the potent brewer into

nds, they slew him without mercy. Froissart
t, "poor men first raised him, and wicked
led him." On hearing of his friend's death,
sailed away from Sluys, vowing vengeance
the Flemings for murdering his ally and faith-
id. As a body, the Flemings were in the
consternation; for Edward had the means of
ig them without going to war. If he shut his
gainst their manufactured goods, or if he, the
'wool-merchant," prohibited the exportation of
ey would have been ruined. Deputies were,
e, sent from all the chief towns of Flanders—
Ghent—to appease his wrath by a solemn
ion that they were guiltless of the murder. It
vard's wisdom to make friends with the hum-
nings. He made political capital out of their
r. He obtained a promise from these deputies
y would in the course of next year send an
ito France, and the alliance was continued.
glish ports were not shut against their goods,
y still continued to receive wool from England.
o little by little the death of Jacques d'Arta-
as forgotten."

y, earl of Lancaster, had, A.D. 1346, carried on
quests in Guienne without meeting any for-
opposition. In that year, however, John,
Normandy, arrived with the flower of the
army, to drive the English from that province.
one hundred thousand men under his com-
King Edward now again took the field.
the middle of July he landed with an army
ng of English, Welsh, and Irish, on the coast of
dy, near Cape La Hogue. Froissart says that
sued out of his ship, and set his foot on the
he fell so rudely that the blood burst out of
. This was interpreted as an ill omen. The
that were about him entreated him to return
ip, and not to land that day, that being "an
n for them." The king inquired, "Where-
dding, "This is a good token for me, for the
sireth to have me," of the which answer all
1 were right joyful. On landing, Edward
nat the Flemings had performed their promise.
time a Flemish army had actually crossed the
frontier. In order to draw the French out of
dy, Edward marched to join them. His army
d of four thousand men-at-arms, eighteen
d infantry, and ten thousand archers. It was
rior force in numbers to that with which he
aded France from the side of Flanders, but it
re formidable, as it was wholly composed of his
bjects, who implicitly obeyed his command.
led his army to the left bank of the Seine,
; the towns if they resisted, and plundering
ven when they peacefully submitted. Before
re were fields and vineyards lading with corn
it, behind him all was desolation. Such a
ting policy was very unwise if he wished to
ver France; but it was in strict conformity to
ges of war in the feudal times. The English
me to Barfleur, which was "given up for fear
1." Plenty of gold and silver and jewels, with
iches, were found in Barfleur. The English
me to Cherbourg, a great and rich town, but
le of which was so strong that it could not be
taken. At Carenten the castle was taken by assault; but at Caen, when the English entered the city, as they passed along the streets the people cast down stones and timber and iron on their heads, by which some five hundred were killed or wounded. In their route along the coast up to Caen, the fleet sailed in view of the army, and all the burgesses captured that were worth ransom were put on board. At this point, however, Edward sent his ships home laden with prisoners, and great riches obtained by plunder.

The English monarch had now fully committed himself to the dangers of his adventure. He was approaching the heart of France; if he proceeded he must conquer or be conquered. But both himself and followers were undaunted. All were inspired with a passion for continental domiinon. Onward they marched, still burning and pillaging in their route. Avoiding castles and walled towns, they marched to Evreux, and from thence to Louviers. Edward's object was to cross the Seine at Rouen, and from thence to march to Calais to join the Flemings. But that object was frustrated. Philip had summoned all his allies and the military tenants of his crown, except those in the army in Guienne, to resist the invader, and his army was encamped on the right bank of the Seine. As the passage of the river below Rouen was dangerous, Edward marched along the left bank to Poissy, sixty miles distant from Rouen. At Poissy his position was one of extreme danger. The bridge was broken down, and he was now separated by two great rivers, the Seine and the Somme, from his Flemish allies. Philip, too, was on the right bank of the river Seine, with an ever-increasing army, watching his movements, and ready at last to encounter him. The honour of France was at stake, and both himself and his subjects were resolved to defend it. Part of Edward's army marched to St. Germains, which was burnt to the ground; and St. Cloud, Bourg-la-Reine, and even Neuilly shared the same fate. Edward struck his tents, and marched towards Paris. This movement obliged the French to march over to the left bank of the Seine to defend his capital. This was what Edward wanted. The bridge at Poissy was repaired, and instead of advancing to Paris, the English passed over it to the right bank of the river, with but little loss, and marched towards the Somme. Philip, however, resolved to prevent their crossing that river. Sending forward detachments of men-at-arms along the right bank of the river, to break down the bridges, and to guard every ford, he made a rapid march upon Amiens. His forces were so numerous that he was gradually shutting up the English in a nook between the Somme and the sea. Edward reached Airaines, from whence he sent his marshals to find some passage. But none could be found, all were well guarded. The French were before and behind him. Philip himself was in the rear of the English, on the left bank, and on he came with the main body of his army towards Airaines. The English marched out in the morning; the French entered that town at noon. There was meat on the spits, bread in the oven, and wine in the tubs, but the English had no time for the refection of their bodies, the repast they had prepared was left for the French. "Right pensive," Edward marched to Oisemont, where he

took up his quarters. How to escape he knew not. As the Somme neared the sea, it became wider and deeper, and hence more dangerous to cross. Hope almost fled; but among the prisoners brought into the English camp, there was "a varlet" named Gobyn Agarre, who for one hundred nobles promised to conduct the English to a ford between Abbeville and the sea, which might be passed at low water. Hope revived, and the English pressed forward to the much desired passage, Gobyn Agarre leading the way. There was a ford over which they might pass; but on the opposite side there was a great company of cavalry under the command of Sir Godemar de Faye, ready to dispute its passage. But there was no alternative. Philip was close in his rear, and Edward commanded his marshals to dash into the water "in the names of God and St. George;" and the most doughty and best mounted alike dashed into the Somme. Midway in that stream they were met by the French cavalry, and there was a fierce conflict, but the English archers cleared the way, and those of the French who were not slain fled in dismay. Edward thanked God for the escape of his army from their great peril, and having given his "varlet" guide his hundred nobles, to which he added the free gift of a horse, he marched forward, and set up his tents in the fields near Cressy.

Edward was now within a few days' march of the frontiers of Flanders; but he seems to have been tired of retreating. He resolved to hazard a battle. It is probable that his recent victory at the ford of Blanchetaque may have induced him to risk an engagement. It was a hazardous step, for his four thousand men-at-arms, with whom he had commenced the invasion, had dwindled down to two thousand three hundred, and his ten thousand archers to five thousand three hundred, while the Irish and Welsh infantry were diminished in proportion. But with this small army Edward resolved to await the French, ten times their number, and give battle. As he traversed the fields of Cressy, he said, "Let us take ground here, for we will go no farther till we have seen our enemies." Froissart says that he chose those fields for his battle-ground because they were the lands of Ponthieu, which had been given to his mother as her marriage-portion; and that, therefore, he was resolved to defend them against King Philip, his adversary. But he must have had a stronger motive than this. It would rather appear that he chose his ground because it was an advantageous position to make a stand against superior numbers. It was on an eminence a little behind the village of Cressy, a village which lay in a valley where flowed a little river called the Maye. Here the army repaired and brightened their armour; and here Edward gave a supper to his earls and barons. Having made good cheer he retired to his oratory, where, says Froissart, he prayed God "that if he fought on the morrow he would bring him off with honour." Edward was not a pious prince, but it was to him the hour of danger, and hence he sought the divine protection.

It was on the 26th of August that the battle of Cressy, one of the most famous in English history, was fought. At early dawn on that day, Edward and his son, the Black Prince, who was sixteen years of age, communicated, and the greater part of his people confessed. Then the king commanded the men-at-arms to assemble: each under his own banner. He was resolved to fight on foot with bow and bill. His army was formed in three divisions. The first division was under the command of the prince of Wales, aided by the earls of Warwick and Oxford, and several other valiant knights. It consisted of eight hundred men-at-arms, two thousand archers, and a thousand Welsh. The second division was under the command of the earls of Northampton and Arundel, and the Lords De Roos and Willoughby. It consisted of eight hundred men-at-arms and twelve hundred archers. Higher up the hill the third division was commanded by the king in person. It consisted of seven hundred men-at-arms and two thousand archers. Mounted on a small palfrey, Edward rode from rank to rank with a white wand in his hand, exhorting his men to defend his honour and his right; and then the army having eaten and drunk, lay down in their ranks upon the grass, and awaited the enemy.

The French monarch marched out of Abbeville on that morning, breathing fury and vengeance on the English. But all his movements were precipitate. There was no preconcerted plan for attacking his enemies, for he looked upon them as his certain prey. It was a mad rush for slaughter, in which his army was encouraged by the French peasantry, who called upon them to slay the English. Hence, when Philip's forces came in sight of Edward's well-ordered divisions, those in front were fatigued by their hurried march, and those in the rear were far behind. A command was given to halt, but it was not obeyed; the horsemen behind continued to press forward, and those in front were eager for victory. As they came near the English, however, they suddenly stopped short, and the unwieldy multitude was thrown into confusion. As the advance fell back, the rear thought there had been fighting, and although they had been eager to get to the front, they too halted. Had there been a cool-headed and skilful general at their head, the disorder might yet have been remedied; but Philip got excited in the tumult, and increased the confusion. He commanded the Genoese archers—fifteen thousand in number—to advance and begin the battle. It was in vain that they pleaded weariness from their long march on foot; there was to be no delay. There was, however, a partial rest given them, for in the hour the command was given, there was an eclipse of the sun, and a storm of rain and thunder. It was five o'clock in the evening before the storm cleared away, and then a second command to advance was given. With the bright sun full in their faces, the Genoese wound up their cross-bows, and with a great leap and cry advanced to battle. The English remained motionless. Then there was another leap and cry, but still the English did not move. A third leap and cry was attended with the same result. At length their arrows sped from their bows; and the English then drew their bows, the arrows from which flew so thick that it seemed "like a storm of snow." Those of the Genoese cross-bowmen had been discharged at too great a distance to do

any execution, but those of the English told with fatal effect. The Genoese fled, and, maddened at the sight, Philip gave command to his men-at-arms to fall upon them, and they were slain in heaps. Again the English archers drew their bowstrings, and their terrible shafts slew horses and men. The cavalry, under the duke d'Alençon, who were slaughtering the Genoese, fell into confusion. Their horses stumbled among the slain, and could not get up again, and their riders—earls, barons, knights, and common men—were despatched by Cornishmen and Welshmen, irregulars in Edward's army, who, armed with long knives, mingled in the confused crowd and slew them without mercy. At length some order was restored in the French ranks. But on what point could they attack the English phalanx with advantage? The archers moved not, and the French everywhere saw "a great hedge before them." Skirting the archers, however, the duke d'Alençon and the earl of Flanders joined battle with the men-at-arms under the prince of Wales. Philip tried to join them, but the "hedge of archers" stopped his way. There was a fierce conflict between the French under the duke d'Alençon, and the English under Prince Edward, the king looking on from a windmill on the top of the hill. The prince was supported by the second division, under the earls of Arundel and Northampton; but at one time the issue of the conflict seemed doubtful. The English were outnumbered, and the French fought with savage fury to retrieve the honours of the day. Anxious for the safety of the prince, the earl of Warwick sent to the king to desire aid from him and his men. "Is my son killed, or wounded, or thrown to the ground?" asked the king. "No, sire," was the reply, "but he is hard beset." "Then," returned the king, "say to them that sent you, that they shall suffer him this day to win his spurs, and ask me not for aid while my son is alive." This was the utterance of a chivalrous knight, and not of a cautious general; but when the message was given, those under the prince were greatly encouraged. The battle raged more fiercely, and d'Alençon and the earl of Flanders fell slain. At the loss of their leaders, the French battalions gave way and fled for their lives: the battle was won. In another part the king of Bohemia, who was nearly blind, had been fighting, but in vain. He had told his men to lead him forward that he might strike one stroke with his sword, and, tying their reins each to the other, that they might not lose him in the press, they obeyed him, and all were slain, the king in the midst. Philip, too, had charged the English archers bravely several times, but each time had been repulsed with great loss. His bravest knights had fallen around him, and before even-song, the French king had not threescore men about him. Of the gallant array of earls and knights who had left the gates of Abbeville that morning, all were either slaughtered or had taken refuge in flight. The victory was complete. Philip fled to the castle of La Broye, from whence, after drinking a cup of wine, he pursued his journey to Amiens. There was no pursuit of the fugitives that night, for the English stayed on the hill to rejoice, making great fires, and lighting torches "because of the great darkness." Edward came down from the windmill to rejoice with them, and, says Froissart, he took the prince in his arms, kissed him, and said, "Sweet son, God give you perseverance! You are my true son, for loyally you have acquitted yourself this day, and worthy are you of a crown." But Edward bowed before his father, and gave *him* all the honour of the victory.

Such was the famous victory of Cressy; a victory won by the bow and the bill, wielded by the sturdy yeoman of England, weapons which henceforth were to fight the battles of England until they were exchanged for the matchlock and pike, and these, again, for the still more deadly weapons, the rifle and bayonet. By the issue of this battle it was demonstrated that the knights of chivalry clad in armour and armed with lances were not invincible. It was a revolution in the art of war. The slaughter made by the bow and the bill in the battle of Cressy seems to be almost incredible. It was not known till the morrow, which was the Sabbath-day, how great the slaughter had been. At early dawn there was a dense fog, and when it cleared away a ghastly scene lay before the victors. It is said that the dead when counted were found to consist of one king, eleven princes, eighty bannerets, twelve hundred knights, and thirty thousand men of inferior rank. But this number seems to have included those who were slain on the Sabbath after the battle of Cressy. On that morning, Edward sent detachments to learn if there were any bodies of French collecting near him. They fell in with two separate forces coming to join Philip, both ignorant of his defeat. These forces were almost annihilated, and many stragglers were found in the open fields, and were slain without mercy. That Sabbath was a day of slaughter, more, it is said, being slain than in the great battle of Saturday. It would seem, indeed, that the whole of that blessed day of rest was devoted to the killing of the French. Stratagem was even employed to get them into the hands of the victors. As many had lost their way in the night and the fog, French standards taken in the battle were erected on eminences, and all who were allured to them were slain. No quarter was given, and in excuse for this inhumanity, it was alleged that the French king had given similar orders to his troops, but it is probable that the real cause of this butchery was that the English did not choose to be encumbered with prisoners. It is singular that no account is given of those who had fallen on the side of the English, for it cannot be supposed that in such a fierce battle that none of Edward's forces perished. Judging from this silence, it may even be supposed that the number of French recorded to have been slain is greatly exaggerated, especially as we find Philip was still able to keep an army in the field. But before the English king recommenced his warlike operations, he performed one sacred duty. On the Monday following the battle of Cressy, he ordered the bodies of the knights who had been slain to be carried to the monastery of Montenay, to be buried in holy ground, and gave permission to the French peasantry, during three days, to inter "the meaner sort." On the same day he departed for Montreuil, and on Thursday, the 31st of August, he commenced the memorable siege of Calais.

While the siege of Calais was progressing, Philip advised his young friend David II., king of Scotland, to invade England. His hope was that, by such an event, his great foeman Edward would be compelled to return to defend his own dominions. The moment seemed favourable for such an enterprise, for not only was Edward engaged before Calais, but that great general, Henry of Lancaster, was still winning battles in Guienne. He had compelled the duke of Normandy to raise the siege of Aiguillon, and was making himself master of the whole of the province by the capture of its strong fortresses. David, therefore, under these circumstances, resolved to invade England. He entered Cumberland in October at the head of three thousand cavalry, and about thirty thousand others, all mounted on their hardy galloways. The fortress called "the pyle of Liddell" was captured, and its governor beheaded. David then marched into the bishopric of Durham, slaughtering and plundering. By that time an English army had assembled in Auckland Park, the great Norman barons and military prelates commanding. Froissart says that Queen Philippa was there, and that she went from rank to rank recommending the safety of their country and the honour of their king to their courage. But Queen Philippa's personal courage was not to be compared with that of the heroic countess de Montfort, who so bravely fought for her liege lord; for Froissart adds, that after haranguing the patriots in Auckland Park, she "retired to a place of safety." It is, indeed, by no means certain that the witty old chronicler's tale is not a flourish of his pen, for it is doubtful if Philippa ever made her appearance in Auckland Park on this occasion. The patriotism of the people needed no queenly inspiration, for the glory her husband had recently gained in the battle-field at Cressy, was sufficient to nerve his admiring subjects into action for the defence of his throne. When the Scots entered the bishopric of Durham, they were ignorant of the assembling of an English army till it was too late to make good their retreat. A battle was fought at Neville's Cross, and again a victory was won by the English archers. The close array of the Scots afforded a fatal mark for the unerring bowmen, "every one of whom carried twenty-four Scotchmen under his girdle." There was a great slaughter. King David, after fighting bravely, was taken prisoner, and three earls, and forty-nine barons and knights shared his fate. David was conducted to London, and lodged in the Tower. The victory of Neville's Cross caused great joy in England, and by it, Philip's design of creating a diversion in his own favour signally failed.

NEVILLE'S TOMB, DURHAM CATHEDRAL.

Undiverted by this Scottish invasion, King Edward still pressed the siege of Calais. Meanwhile the countess de Montfort, aided by an English force, commanded by Sir Thomas Dagworth, successfully defended her infant son's inheritance. In June, A.D. 1347, as Charles de Blois was besieging Roche Derrien, he was suddenly attacked by the English, and defeated with great loss. Charles was taken prisoner and sent over to England, where *he* too was confined in the Tower of London. His wife, Joan, fought some time for her captive husband, but in vain; the "brave lady" of Breton preserved her son's dominion, and he not only inherited it, but transmitted it to his posterity. By these victories, King Edward was left to prosecute the siege of Calais at leisure. It was a place of great strength, and well defended by its garrison and inhabitants. He was resolved to take it by force if possible, but he soon found that it could not be taken without the destruction of a great portion of his army. Hence he resolved to reduce it by famine. He blockaded the coast by his fleet; established his army in huts built outside the walls; and threw up entrenchments which were strongly guarded. Calais was thus rendered inaccessible by sea and land. His plan was rightly divined by its governor John de Vienne, and to save his provisions he turned out seventeen hundred aged men, women, and children, and drove them toward the English lines. Edward gave them each two silver pennies and a meal, and then they went forth into the highways in search of new homes. At that time Queen Philippa had joined her lord at Calais with a great company of ladies, and there was great feasting and joy in the English camp. It is probable that this event may have been favourable to these poor outcasts, for the English king had not been accustomed to such acts of mercy. At a later date, indeed, when five hundred more unhappy beings were thrust out of Calais, all of them perished between its walls and the English camp. Philip watched the progress of the siege of Calais with the deepest anxiety, and resolved to make one great effort to save it. He summoned all his vassals and allies to meet at Amiens, and it is recorded that he was enabled to raise an army of 150,000 men. He hoisted the Oriflamme—the

sacred banner of France, unfurled only against infidels—and came to Whitsand. By unfurling the Oriflamme on this occasion, he endeavoured to excite his followers on sacred grounds; but however the courage of the French may have been excited, it was of no avail. There were only two roads to Calais by which it could have been approached, one along the sea-shore, and the other over bogs and marshes. Both these were well guarded by the English, and Philip dared not attempt the passage of either. After a fruitless negotiation, therefore, and some idle challenges to come out and fight him, Philip left Calais to its fate. He returned to Amiens, where he disbanded his army. Thus deserted, the governor, John de Vienne, hung out the flag of England, and asked to capitulate. Its garrison and inhabitants were starving. They had eaten all their horses and even their dogs and cats, and all hope of obtaining provisions was gone. The "tall ships" of England swept the Channel, and it was in vain that the French fleet had attempted to relieve the town. There was no hope, therefore, but in capitulation. Enraged, however, at their obstinate defence of the town, Edward demanded that they should surrender at discretion; that they should submit to his will, to ransom or to put to death whom he pleased. To this the governor would not consent. They had endured much pain, he said, but they would endure more rather than the meanest in the town should suffer more than the greatest of them all. Sir Walter Manny and several English barons then pleaded in favour of the besieged. Edward then somewhat relaxed his terms, but they were still hard and humiliating. He demanded that six chief burgesses of the town should appear before him, bare-headed, bare-footed, and bare-legged, and in their shirts, with halters about their necks, and the keys of the town in their hands, to submit to his will; and this done, he promised to take the rest to mercy. Such was the answer Sir John de Vienne received, as he stood upon the wall, from the lips of the brave Sir Walter Manny. The demand was made known to the people in the market-place, and they all wept piteously. The condition was a hard one, and they knew not what to do. But in the midst of their grief and irresolution, one of the richest burgesses of the town, Eustace de St. Pierre, offered to put his life in jeopardy to save the residue. His example was followed by John Dayre, James of Wysant, and Peter his brother, with two others, all of whom went out of the gate appareled as the king desired, and stood between the gate and the barriers. The barriers were thrown down, and the six patriotic burgesses were admitted into Edward's presence. As they approached him they laid the keys at his feet, and falling on their knees implored his mercy. The hardy English warriors present wept at the sight, but Edward "eyed them spitefully." The blood of the Plantagenet boiled with rage; he commanded their heads to be struck off. Every one around him entreated him to be more merciful, Sir Walter Manny imploring him not to tarnish his reputation by slaying men who had placed themselves in his hands to save the lives of their fellow-citizens. Still Edward was inexorable. Making a grimace, he ordered the headsman to be summoned. The queen then entreated him to be merciful. Kneeling at his feet, she said, "Gentle sire, since I passed the sea in much peril, I have desired nothing of you, therefore I now require of you, in the honour of the Son of the Virgin Mary, and for the love of me, that you will have mercy on these six men." Looking at her for a while, Edward exclaimed, "Dame, I would you had been in some other place; but I cannot deny you. I give these men to you, do your pleasure with them." Edward was thus saved from a crime which would have blackened his memory for ever. Philippa, it is said, had the six burgesses brought into her chamber, and newly clothed, and after she had entertained them with refreshment, and given them six nobles each, they were led through the English host and set at liberty. On the following day, August 4th, the king and queen entered Calais to the sound of martial music, and they remained there till Philippa was delivered of a daughter, who was called "Margaret of Calais." In order to secure this important conquest, Edward turned out all its inhabitants, and peopled it with his English subjects. Soon after this, a truce was concluded through the mediation of the Pope between the rival kings, and in October Edward returned to England. This truce was to continue to July A.D. 1348, but it was gradually prolonged to A.D. 1355.

There was great wealth brought into England by the plunder of France. Many who went to the wars "poor wights" came home "rich lords." What with prizes made on the sea, and pillages by land, the country became stocked with French goods and furniture of every description. But the treasures spent in this war seem to have exceeded those derived from it. In January, A.D. 1348, Edward summoned a parliament at Westminster. Personally he was in great want of money. When parliament met, he asked their advice—for, unlike his predecessors, he sought their advice in every emergency—touching the prosecution of the war with France. Suspecting that this was but a prelude to a demand for a subsidy, no answer was given for the moment; but when, three days after, he represented that the French were making preparations to invade England, and demanded an aid to repel that invasion; after uttering some complaints of taxation and consequent poverty, three-fifteenths were voted to be levied in three years. There was no danger of an invasion of England, but in the course of this year an attempt was made by the French to recover Calais by bribing the governor whom Edward had appointed before his return—Almeric de Pavia. He was to receive twenty thousand crowns for his treachery. This plot was discovered, and the treacherous Italian was pardoned on condition that he would proceed in his plot, and betray the French into Edward's hands. This was done. The king, with the prince of Wales and Sir Walter Manny, with a body of eight hundred men-at-arms, and one thousand archers, went secretly to Calais and entered the castle. Soon after their arrival, a body of one hundred Frenchmen came to the castle with the price of the surrender of the town, and were all slain or captured. Outside the gates a French army was waiting to be admitted, and the English rushing out upon them, a battle ensued, in which the

French were defeated. Many French men-at-arms were taken prisoners, and it is said that Edward afterwards entertained them in the great hall of the castle. In the battle he had fought hand-to-hand with the Sieur Ribeaumont, who had fought so bravely that Edward presented him with a chaplet of pearls and his liberty, declaring that he was the most valiant knight he had ever encountered. Having then divested Almeric de Pavia of his command, and bestowed it on Sir John Beauchamp, Edward and his son the Black Prince returned to England.

The calamities of war were succeeded by a depopulating pestilence. During this year a succession of earthquakes shook the southern and central regions of the Continent, and though England escaped this visitation, it was deluged with rain, which ruined the harvest. A mysterious disease followed, vulgarly called the black death. It was a glandular typhus, or plague: a plague which is calculated to have swept away twenty-five millions of the inhabitants of Europe. Like the cholera of modern times, it had its origin in the Far East. From the heart of China on it came like an angel of death across the desert of Cobi and the wilds of Tartary, spreading over the Levant, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Germany, and France, and at length, A.D. 1349, it spread its dark wings over England. According to some historians, one-half of the population fell victims to this great pestilence; and it is certain that the infliction was one of the most terrible on record. The poor suffered most. When it had passed away there were not hands enough to till the soil. Lands went out of cultivation for want of labourers; and those who could carry away their capital, fled to other countries. To prevent emigration, Edward issued a precept to the mayors and bailiffs of the ports, directing them not to suffer any one to leave the kingdom, unless he were a merchant, notary, or messenger. So many of the labouring class had perished in the plague, that those who escaped naturally sought higher wages or their services. This gave rise to an arbitrary enactment, called "The Statute of Labourers," by which it was ordained that every able-bodied man and woman, not being a merchant, or exercising any craft, or having estate or land, should be bound to serve, whenever required to do so, at the wages accustomed to be given in the twentieth year of the reign, and in five or six common years next before; and that if they refused to work at such wages, they should be committed to the next gaol. The statute also enacted that all labourers quitting their service should be imprisoned, and that masters who gave higher wages should be fined double the amount paid. The same regulations were applied to all artificers; but in order to balance low wages against commodities, it was enacted that all provisions of every kind should be sold at a reasonable price. As a climax to the folly of this statute, it was further ordained that no one should give alms to the able-bodied, or presume to encourage such in their sloth, under pain of imprisonment. The principles of this arbitrary statute pervaded the relations of masters and servants for a long series of years, and some of its selfish features still cling to the laws of settlement. Yet from that day to this, the laws of nature have proved too strong for the laws of policy; for the great truth of Scripture that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," is engraved on the universal heart of those who live by the sweat of their brow.

During the progress of this pestilence, England was threatened with an invasion by a fleet of Spanish pirates, which had in recent years sided with the French, and plundered many English vessels. Edward himself went with his fleet to encounter the sea-rovers. A battle was fought within sight of the hills behind Winchelsea, and after a severe conflict, in which both the king and the prince of Wales were at one time in great danger, a brilliant victory was obtained, twenty-four out of the forty ships of which the Spanish fleet consisted were captured.

A few days before this naval victory, Philip of France died, and was succeeded by John, duke of Normandy, a prince still more unfortunate than his predecessor. One of John's first acts was to prolong the truce with King Edward, but it was ill observed. The French and English still did battle on the seas and in Brittany and the south of France. There was no healing of the breach created by the rivalry of Edward and Philip. The animosities called into action by it between the English and French were so great and deep-rooted, that neither the truce which subsisted between them, nor the pestilence which had ravaged both countries, could restrain them from mutual hostilities.

Passing over the minor conflicts which occurred in Guienne, Brittany, and the marches of Calais, as events of no real historical importance, we arrive at another great struggle between the enraged nations. During the latter years of the reign of King Philip, it had been proposed by Edward that if he would give him absolute sovereignty over the provinces of France which had been held as fiefs by preceding English kings, then he would resign his pretensions to the French crown. This proposal presented a secure basis for a lasting peace, but it had been sternly rejected. After the accession of John, the proposal was renewed, and he appears to have been inclined to accept it, but the French procurators refused to agree to such a settlement of the quarrel. The state of France, A.D. 1353, when the procurators broke off the negotiations, was not such as to give much hope of success, for it was torn by faction and discord, which had in some places lit up the flames of civil war. Nevertheless, Edward's offer was rejected, and thus the gauntlet was again thrown down, which, nothing loth, was accepted. Probably the cession of Calais, upon which Edward insisted as part of his bargain for giving up his presumed right and title to the throne of France, was the great stumbling-block in the way of peace; for Calais was a jewel in the French crown, as it afterwards came to be in that of England.

The English king had foreseen that the negotiations for peace on such terms would prove abortive, and had made great preparations for renewing the war with vigour. His parliament had, in the year 1352, delivered to him a roll containing a grant of three-tenths and three-fiftieths, to be levied in three years—bargaining at the same time for certain privileges—so that by the time the truce expired, A.D. 1355, he was fully prepared once more to take the field to do battle for the crown of France.

It was in the autumn of that year that there was in a gathering of hosts for the slaughter. Prince ward sailed from Plymouth with a gallant train of glish knights, and an army, to Bordeaux. He ned the campaign in the south of France. His y consisted of sixty thousand men, only a portion whom, however, were English. Some knights of country, with their retainers, greatly swelled his nbers. Prince Edward marched from Bordeaux to foot of the Pyrenees, and, taking a northward rse, he laid cities and towns in ashes, and filled the d with desolation. The fertile province of Langue-, which had not been visited by the scourge of war at least two generations, was laid waste. It is re-ded that, besides the destruction of commercial towns, o hundred villages were burnt to the ground, thus king war upon the peaceful peasantry. In modern ms his campaign was a raid rather than a war perly so-called, for he engaged no enemy, and he rned to winter quarters at Bordeaux unmolested.

Whilst Prince Edward was thus desolating the th, the king was ravaging the north of France. arrived at Calais in the last week of October, and ving joined the forces he brought with him to those found there, he led them to the Somme. King hn lay at St. Omers; but on the approach of the glish, he retired, and Edward, after following him far as Hesden, desolating the country in his route, m want of provisions returned to Calais.

Meanwhile, the Scots had again crossed the border, d had retaken their town of Berwick. At this ws, Edward hurried home, and having obtained pplies from his parliament, set out for Newcastle to n his army. In January, A.D. 1356, he appeared fore Berwick. The Scots withdrew, and Berwick s regained without striking a blow. Resolved to t an end to their constant forays, and to effect a al conquest of Scotland, Edward, with a numerous ny, crossed the border. But before he resumed y military operations of moment, he made a grand rchase. Edward Baliol still bore the title of king Scotland—which was a mere name, without power revenue—and as he was now old and childless, ward purchased the crown of him for five thousand rks ready cash, and a yearly pension of two thou-d more during his life. The parchment deeds of s sale of a kingdom were duly signed, sealed, and ivered, and having safely deposited them in his st as valuable title-deeds—though they were in lity worthless—the English king marched forward take possession of his bargain by force of arms. marched through the Lothians, burnt Haddington l Edinburgh, and laid waste the country. But e his career was checked. His fleet, laden with visions, could not make the port of Leith, and he compelled to retreat, the Scots, who had retired re him, harassing his rear, and inflicting fearful geance for the devastations he had committed. returned to England soon after Candlemas, whence inroad on this occasion was called "the burnt dlemas," and many an English village was after-ds destroyed by fire, in revenge for those which he kindled in Scotland.

rom some cause unrecorded, King Edward now e a pause in his military career. He neither renewed the war in Scotland, nor reinforced his "sweet son" in France. Perhaps he was tired of seeking glory in the battle-field; perhaps, as Prince Edward had won the victory of Cressy, he conceived that he wanted no further aid from England. But whatever may have been his motives for "resting on his arms," he placed that valiant son of his in such jeopardy, that had he not been a great military genius, he must have perished. In July, the Black Prince marched out of Bordeaux upon a second expedition of waste and pillage. History does not record why it was that his army had dwindled away, but instead of having an army of *sixty* thousand, as in his previous raid, under his command, it is now said that he only had *twelve* thousand, all of whom were Gascons, except a body of English archers. With this small force he traversed the countries of Agenois, Querci, Limousin, Auvergne, and entered Berri, plundering and burning towns and villages, and treading under foot fields laden with corn, and vineyards rich in generous fruit, as he advanced. He was now in the very heart of France; and as he knew that the French king was marching against him, he resolved to retreat. He was not aware from what point King John was advancing, and, deeming it the safest route, he took the road leading to Poictiers. But it so happened that was the very point to which King John was directing his course in search of the marauders. On the 17th of September, the van of Prince Edward's army fell in with the rear of that of King John. The whole country swarmed with the enemy, and the Black Prince discovered that his retreat to Gascony was cut off. There was no help for it: he must either fight his way or surrender. The odds were greatly against him. Poictiers was a spot calculated to inspire the French with courage, for it was there that the founder of the French monarchy, Clovis, had defeated the Visigoths, under the great Alaric; and that Charles Martel had driven back an immense host of Moslem invaders. Besides this, if the old chroniclers give the numbers correctly, King John had an army consisting of sixty thousand cavalry, and a numerous infantry, while Prince Edward had now, from losses or desertion, not more than ten thousand altogether under his command. Hence it is said that the French felt they had the English prince and his little army in their power.

On the morning of Sunday, the 18th day of September, there was a great blowing of trumpets in King John's army. It was a call to arms, and every man mounted his horse, and went into the field assured of victory. Three knights were sent forward to reconnoitre. On their return, these knights reported that the English were few in number, but were wisely ordered. Their archers they said, lined the hedges and banks of a road on which four horsemen only could ride, while its terminus was fortified with men-at-arms afoot, with archers before them. It was their opinion that the prince and his army could not easily be discomfited. It is probable that it was from this report, and not as commonly stated, from motives of mercy, that Cardinal Perigord was allowed by King John to go to the prince of Wales to show him that he was in danger, and persuade him to surrender. "Save my honour, and the honour of my army," was

the reply of the prince to the cardinal's entreaties, "and I will listen to any terms." But the cardinal could not save the honour of Edward and his army. All that day he rode to and fro from King John and Prince Edward on his errand of mercy, but could accomplish no agreement. Edward offered to give up all he had gained in that expedition, and to swear that he would not bear arms against the French king, but John required, as his ultimatum, that the prince and one hundred knights should surrender to him as prisoners of war. "Never will I be made a prisoner," replied the prince, haughtily, "but with sword-in-hand."

Night separated the combatants. On the Monday morning, the cardinal again repaired to Edward, but it was to tell him that he must do his best to save himself, for King John was inexorable in his demand. "Then," said the prince, "may God defend the right!" The French marshals with their battalions now approached to force Edward's position. They were drawn up in three lines. The first was commanded by the Duke of Orleans, the king's brother; the second by the Dauphin and his two brothers, Louis and John; and the third by the king in person, with whom was associated his youngest son Philip. Three hundred men in complete armour, and nobly mounted, were directed to pass the defile to disperse the archers at the terminus, and make way for the rest of the army. Four abreast they entered that defile, and for a time no bow was bent against them, but at length the command was given, and from the hedgerows there sped a flight of deadly arrows, and while one-half fell in the passage, the other was cut in pieces at the terminus. Men-at-arms on foot now entered the passage, and again the deadly shafts from behind the hedgerows laid them in the dust. The lane became choked up with the dead and wounded both of men and horses. One of the marshals who led this attack was slain, the other was wounded and taken prisoner. The stout bowmen of England performed deadly work by their arrows, and the Gascon men-at-arms rushed among the disordered press, and slew both knights and squires without mercy. Prince Edward now became the assailant. The English archers appeared on the flank and rear of the French army, and again their arrows did their deadly work. They shot so thickly and so well that the French did not know which way to turn to escape death. The second division, under the duke of Normandy, did not wait to be struck down, for the knights deserted their banners and fled. In the midst of the confusion eight hundred lances were detached to escort the Dauphin and his brothers, Louis and John, from the danger, and then the division under their command dispersed in wild disorder. The knights and men-at-arms under the Black Prince now mounted their horses, and shouting, "St. George of Guienne!" rushed down the lane, and crossing the open moor, fell upon the main body of the French army. The shock was fearful. Down went man and horse to the ground. The constable of France, with most of his knights, were slain in that fierce onslaught. A body of German cavalry was next attacked and put to flight; the arrow of the English bowman, and not the lance of the knight, dispersed them in dismay. At length King John's division was encountered, and he proved himself "a full right good knight." Sir John Chandos had told the Black Prince that John's valour would not permit him to flee, and that "please God and St. George," he would remain with them; and so it turned out. Had his men fought as he fought, the issue of the conflict might have proved different. Leading a division on foot, he fought desperately with a battle-axe, and when nearly all had forsaken him, he and his son Philip fought bravely. Even when he had received two wounds, and was beaten to the ground, he rose again and still strove to defend himself, the English and Gascons in vain calling upon him to "surrender or die." He would have been slain, but a young knight from St. Omer having called upon him in good French to surrender, on the promise that he would lead him to "his cousin the prince of Wales," he gave him his right-hand glove, and said, "I surrender to you." Sir Denis de Morbec, however, had much to do in conducting John to his cousin. There was much struggling between the English and Gascons, all of whom were anxious to have the honour of capturing the French monarch. It seems probable that he would have been slain had not the earl of Warwick and the Lord Cobham rescued him from the fierce disputants. But thus rescued, he was conducted, with his valiant son, Philip, to the prince of Wales, who was reclining under his banner, set "a high on a bush," because in the battle he had been "sore chafed."

Froissart says that the Black Prince was courageous and bold as a lion, and that he took great pleasure in fighting, and chasing his enemies. But Edward was not always fierce in nature. He treated his royal cousin right royally. That night he made a supper in his "red pavilion" to the French king and the great lords who had been taken prisoners. He even declined the honour of sitting at table with him, but stood behind him while he was eating and drinking, and entertained him with soothing and consolatory discourse. His father, he averred, would bear him all honour and amity, and would so treat him that they would become sworn friends. As for King John's valour, that, he said, was matchless, and it had gained him the admiration of both armies. Every Englishman who had witnessed his deeds of arms accorded him the prize and chaplet. But Prince Edward was not generous enough to set his royal cousin free. On the day after the battle, he marched with the monarch of France as a captive to Bordeaux, having first admitted the great bulk of the French knights to easy ransom.

There were great rejoicings in England when the news of this famous victory arrived. There was a solemn thanksgiving in all the churches, and a great ringing of the bells in their steeples. It certainly was a "famous victory," if the number and quality of the prisoners and the slain constitute fame. It is recorded that the French left dead on this scene of blood, two dukes, nineteen earls, numerous knights and gentlemen, and about six thousand men-at-arms, besides common soldiers. The prisoners were still more numerous, and of higher quality than the slain. Besides the king and his valiant young son, there were captured, it is said, three princes of the blood, an archbishop, seventeen earls, one thousand five

THE FRENCH KING BROUGHT PRISONER TO LONDON.

l lesser barons, knights, and gentlemen, and thousand men-at-arms. Then, again, the spoils French camp fell into the hands of the victors, Prince Edward's little army was loaded with s well as glory. But at what price this vic- s bought we are not informed. It is said that Edward's army suffered but little in the action; cannot be supposed that so many thousand could be slain and taken prisoners without able loss on the part of the English and . As in the victory of Cressy, indeed, it may e suspected that the old chroniclers have not he numbers correctly.

rd, prince of Wales, spent the winter at Bor- In March, A.D. 1357, he concluded a truce e Dauphin Charles, who had been appointed nt of France, and soon after he returned to l with his royal captive and Prince Philip. eparations had been made in London for their ant entry. It was on the 24th of May that ared its streets, and their reception was mag-

My lord mayor and the aldermen, attended ousand citizens, all richly attired and well , received them at Southwark, and conducted to the city. King John was received more honoured guest than a captive. While he ough the streets on a cream-coloured charger parisoned, the hero of the field of Poictiers ably by his side as his page, on a little black

It was a pageant in which the spirit of strangely contrasted with the pride of the onquerors, whose wont it was to lead captive rough the streets of Rome in chains. King also, treated the royal captive with all the due to a crowned head; although, if his pre- to the French crown had been just, John ve been a rebel and an usurper. John was a palace belonging to the duke of Lancaster avoy; and in the winter following there were

RUINS, SAVOY PALACE.

jousts in Smithfield in which the kings of France and Scotland, as guests of King Edward, were present to take their parts in feats of arms; for at this time, David, king of Scotland, long a prisoner in the Tower, had been ransomed.

It has been seen that Edward had purchased the crown of Scotland of that childish old man, Edward Baliol, but he appears now to have been convinced that he had made a bad bargain. His claims to the crowns of both France and Scotland appear to have undergone a great change, probably from the difficulties by which their attainment was surrounded. David, king of Scotland, had been eleven years a captive in the Tower, during which time the conquest of Scotland was found to be impracticable. The government, conducted by Robert Stuart, his nephew and heir, was not only able to defend itself, but to attack England. For several years Edward had shown a disposition to set David at liberty, but the price he had hitherto asked was more than the Scots would give. At length, however, terms were agreed upon. David's ransom was settled at one hundred thousand marks, to be paid in ten years, during which period a truce was to subsist between the two nations. Having given some of the sons of his principal nobility as hostages for the payment, David was set at liberty on the 3rd of October, and after spending some time with Edward as his guest, he returned into his own kingdom.

After the battle of Poictiers, France fell into a state of anarchy. As the nobles and knights of France were considered to have "shamed the realm" by their defeat at Poictiers, there was an insurrection of the peasants. The leader of this insurrection was Jacques Bonhomme, whence in history it is known as the Jacquerie. Their watchword was destruction to all French gentlemen. At first there were only about one hundred villagers under Jacques Bonhomme, but as they traversed the country, their numbers swelled to a hundred thousand. There was everywhere plunder and vengeance; for though many of them were slain, and others taken and executed, they still went on destroying "like enraged dogs." The slaughter of men, women, and children was so fearful, that the wolves were attracted from the woods to consume the flesh of the slain. At length, however, this insurrection was suppressed. As they surrounded the castle of Meaux, in which several hundred ladies had taken refuge, two knights and their followers issued forth and slew them till they were weary. Seven thousand were slain on that day, and the Jacquerie reign was over.

But France was not yet tranquil. Its peace was not only invaded by the peasantry, but by the burgesses and the very nobles themselves. During John's captivity in England, the government of the Dauphin Charles was continually harassed by contending factions. To add to the disorder, Charles, king of Navarre, who had been thrown into prison three years before by King John, escaped, and set up a claim to the crown of France. He hastened to Paris, and, aided by his great partisan Stephen Marcel, provost of the merchants, who met him on his road with ten thousand people, he entered Paris in triumph. For a time the Dauphin was compelled to yield to all

the demands of Charles of Navarre, but in the end he triumphed over him. The Parisians, ever fickle, murdered the famous provost of the merchants, loaded their idol, the king of Navarre, with bitter curses, and returned to their obedience. The government gained new strength daily.

Meanwhile, two legates had been endeavouring to restore harmony between England and France. Terms had been agreed upon between King Edward and John, but they were rejected by the regency. The treaty of peace was actually concluded and signed by the two kings on the 24th of March, A.D. 1359, but when a copy of it was sent into France it was repudiated by the estates. And no wonder, for besides stipulating that the English king should receive an enormous ransom for the liberation of John, he was to have restored to him absolutely, Normandy, Aquitaine, and all the provinces which had belonged to Henry II. Edward himself could scarcely have expected that such terms would be adopted by the French, but, nevertheless, on their rejection, he pretended to be enraged at what he termed the bad faith of the estates, and resolved to compel them to consent. In the autumn he passed over to France with an army more numerous than he had yet led to the Continent. He laid siege to Rheims; but the strength of that place was so great that he was compelled to abandon his enterprise. He marched from Rheims to Burgundy, and from thence to Paris, in front of which he encamped on the 31st of March, A.D. 1360. But here, again, he was baffled. The French would not leave the city to fight, and as he was not in a position to besiege Paris, he retired towards Brittany. By this time his army had been greatly reduced. Men and horses had perished by hundreds from famine, fatigue, and exhaustion. It is said that Edward's heart was touched at the sight; but as he had witnessed scenes of death more terrible before, it is probable that his emotion would have proved momentary, and that, having repaired his losses, he would have again renewed his contest with France. But there was another scene witnessed by him, which, in those days of superstition, was well calculated to appal the stoutest heart. As he approached Chartres, such a terrible tempest swept over his camp that he was reminded of the last great day, and as he cast his eyes towards the church of Notre Dame, he inwardly vowed he would treat for peace. That vow was subsequently performed at the altar of Notre Dame; and, accordingly, an armistice was arranged, which was followed by a treaty, known in history as "the treaty of Bretigny." By that treaty Edward resigned his pretensions to the crown of France, and to the territories of Anjou, Maine, and Normandy; and restored all his conquests, except Guisness and Calais. On the other hand, the territories of Guienne and Poitou, with their dependencies, Saintonge, Agenois, the Limousin, and Perigord, with other districts in the south, and the county of Ponthieu in the north-west, which were his in right of his mother, were ceded to him in full sovereignty. Three million crowns of gold were to be paid in six years, as King John's ransom; and hostages having been given for the due fulfilment of this treaty, Edward came home to England, and John was liberated, and returned to France.

On his return to France, John found that his country, once fertile, rich, and flourishing, had been made, by the united ravages of the English and Jacquerie, like a desert. Lands lay untilled, fields lay waste, and houses on every hand were crumbling into ruins. To perpetuate the misery which had fallen upon his kingdom, after the peace of Bretigny it was ravaged by bands of discharged soldiers—Germans, Brabanters, Flemings, Hainaulters, Gascons, and "bad Frenchmen"—who had during the war either been in the pay of France or England. These "free companies," as they were called, associated together, chose skilful leaders, and made war upon the government. France, in truth, was in such an impoverished and unsettled condition, that John was prevented from fulfilling any of the most important parts of the treaty. He had the will and the desire, but he had not the power to fulfil his obligations. There was no money to pay the ransom, and whenever he mentioned the cession of the territories guaranteed by the treaty of Bretigny to Edward, he encountered the most violent opposition both from his sons and his nobles. One of his sons, the duke of Anjou, even broke his parole by leaving Calais, where he had been living as one of the hostages, by escaping to Paris; and his father was so much affected by his son's dishonourable conduct, that, despite the persuasions and entreaties of his ministers, he repaired to London to make his own peace with Edward, and was again lodged in the palace of the Savoy, where he died, A.D. 1364.

In the meantime, Edward had obtained possession of the provinces ceded to him by the treaty of Bretigny. The prince of Wales, who had, A.D. 1362, married his cousin Jane—the Fair Maid of Kent—daughter of Edmund Plantagenet, was appointed to the possession and government of those provinces, with the title of Prince of Aquitaine. Edward conceived that, by appointing his son to this government, he should reconcile its nobles to the English rule. His choice was no doubt the best he could have made, for the prince was amiable, possessed of high qualities for governing, and was, moreover, renowned as a warrior all over the Continent. Still he was not a welcome ruler. The population submitted, but they resolved never to forget their allegiance to the crown of which the English monarchs had once been vassals. As Frenchmen, they adhered warmly to the feudal superiority of France. Their discontent was fostered by Charles V. of France, who on the death of John had succeeded to his father's throne. Charles was no warrior, but he was a sagacious politician. It was by his sagacity that he had rid France of the dangerous "free companies." At that time, Pedro V., called "the Cruel," was the legitimate king of Castile, but his tyranny had provoked insurrection. That insurrection was quelled, and the insurgents sought refuge in the territories of the king of Arragon. But there was no safety for them in Arragon: Pedro made war against the king of Arragon, and the Castilian exiles fled to France. Pedro had given mortal offence to Charles V., king of France, for among the murders which he had committed was that of his wife Blanche, a princess belonging to the royal family of France. Don Enrique, half-brother to Don Pedro, was one of

ilian exiles, and at his suggestion, and by the
harles and the Pope, both of whom had been
by the progress of the "free companies" in
Enrique engaged them to fight against the
ı tyrant. Thirty thousand of these veterans
hemselves under the command of the cele-
ın Guesclin, and marching across the Pyrenees,
as driven from his throne. He had previously
into an alliance with Edward III., and he
he court of the Black Prince at Bordeaux.
ward and the Black Prince considered Pedro,
he was, the legitimate sovereign of Castile,
y resolved upon his restoration by force of
Probably the support which Charles had
nrique was a potent reason why they so
y accorded that support, for though England
nce were at peace, they were still rivals. But
r the motive was, in the year 1367 the Black
ed a great army of English, Gascons, and
s from Bordeaux. In midwinter he led his
rough the pass of Roncesvalles into the open
stween Navarete and Najara, in Navarre. It
r Najara that he met with the forces com-
by Don Enrique. The Don is represented to
d an army three times more numerous than
Prince Edward, who himself had thirty thou-
lect troops around him. The battle which
was one of real soldiery on both sides: it
English yeomen against the "free companies."
ommenced by the young duke of Lancaster,
ulated the military fame of his brother Ed-
But it was by the Black Prince himself that
ory was chiefly won. The prestige of his
ave courage to his followers, and wherever he
e was victory. Having dispersed a division
on Tello, count of Biscay, he advanced against
amanded by Don Enrique, and after a fierce
in which the Castilians threw stones from
vhich shattered helmets and skull-caps, and
glish archers sent their more deadly arrows
ir bows, "to the great annoyance and death
paniards," the Black Prince triumphed. Don
as restored to his throne; but the victory was
useless to Prince Edward, but injurious both
elf and his country. Pedro had promised to
cost of the war, but it was in vain that he
in Castile for the money. After, therefore,
lf starved in Castile, and contracting debts,
at was still worse, a malady which finally
him to his grave, the Black Prince returned
shattered army to Bordeaux. And after all
ting for Don Pedro, in six months he was
from his throne, and murdered by his half-
Don Enrique, who again, under the pro-
f Charles of France, became king of Castile.
Edward was thus wasting the strength of
lish for an ungrateful tyrant, Charles, king of
was fast regaining strength. He was now,
9, almost ready for open war. Don Enrique
nd by treaty to assist him when he declared
l the king of Navarre, who had, by a bribe,
the army of the Black Prince to march
the famous pass of Roncesvalles without
tion, was now bought over by Charles to do
the like favour when required. Nor was this
all. On his return from Spain, Prince Edward imposed a heavy burden of taxation upon the people of Gascony, to defray the debts incurred in that war; and the great lords of that country, still deeming King Charles to be their lord paramount, carried their complaints to the foot of his throne. As Edward was growing old, and the health of the Black Prince was such as to render him unfit to undertake an active campaign, Charles deemed it a golden opportunity of recovering the territories ceded by the treaty of Bretigny. He summoned Edward as prince of Aquitaine and his vassal, to appear before him at Paris, to answer the charges made against him by the Gascon lords. His interference was a violation of the treaty of Bretigny; but it was a ready way of picking a quarrel with England. Prince Edward replied that he would appear in Paris, but it would be at the head of sixty thousand men; but his father adopted a policy of conciliation. He was willing, he said, for the sake of peace, to give up all the territories ceded to him by the treaty of Bretigny, except Poitou and Guienne, with the adjacent provinces in his possession. But neither Prince Edward's threat nor King Edward's conciliatory offer was of any avail. Charles poured his troops into Aquitaine, the lords of Poitou and Guienne aiding him in his enterprise.

War between England and France was now renewed. As Charles had so flagrantly violated the treaty of Bretigny, Edward reassumed his title of king of France. Parliament made liberal grants to enable him to prosecute the war with vigour; and as an inducement to soldiers of fortune, he promised lands and honours in France if they would aid him in its conquest. Reinforcements were hastily forwarded to the Black Prince, in the south; and the duke of Lancaster was despatched with an army from Calais into the north-western provinces of France. Those provinces were laid waste by fire and sword; but in the meantime, Charles was victorious in the south. Several towns and castles were captured, while others were delivered up by the garrisons and inhabitants. The brave Lord Chandos had hitherto had the command against the French; but in January, A.D. 1370, he was killed in a skirmish, and the Black Prince then took the field in person. The dukes of Berri and Anjou were marching against the English, but, finding he was at their head, they retreated. Having garrisoned the towns captured, or acquired by the free will of the inhabitants, they disbanded their army. Among those towns which had been delivered up by the people's free will, was Limoges, the capital of Limousin, a town on which Edward had conferred many honours and privileges. At the instance of its bishop, that city revolted, and admitted a French garrison for its defence. Enraged at the ingratitude of its inhabitants, the Black Prince swore that he would do nothing till he had recaptured that town, and made the traitors rue their perfidy. There was deep revenge in his heart as he lay on his litter superintending the siege of that devoted city. He had summoned its citizens to return to their duty, and expel the French, but he was only answered by a stern defiance. There was a brave defence, but at length the walls of the city were undermined, and the English entered by the breach. The threatened

vengeance was now carried into execution. It was in vain that the people cried for mercy, his ears were deaf to their cries. More than three thousand were murdered by Edward's infuriated soldiery. Froissart calls them "veritable martyrs," and not without reason, for it was by the authorities the city had been delivered up to the French, and not by the common citizens. About eighty knights retreated to one of the squares, and placing their backs against a wall, fought with such courage, that Prince Edward became "mild and merciful at the sight of their gallantry." Some of them were slain, but those who surrendered were pardoned. Limoges was ransacked, and then burnt to the ground. This was the last warlike act of the Black Prince, and it confers no honour on his memory. After the destruction of the town and people of Limoges, Prince Edward returned to England, leaving his brother, John of Gaunt, his successor in the government of Gascony. About this time John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, married Constance, the eldest daughter of Don Pedro, "the tyrant," and he assumed, in right of his wife, the title of king of Castile. This was an unwise step. Don Enrique was firmly seated on that throne, and, by a natural consequence, he now prepared to co-operate with Charles of France in his war with the English. John of Gaunt returned to England to make merry with his Castilian bride; and the earl of Pembroke was appointed commander of the English forces during his absence. He was sent with a powerful fleet containing reinforcements, but when he arrived off Rochelle, he was encountered by a fleet more powerful than his own, and after two days' hard fighting, victory declared in favour of the Spaniards. Pembroke was taken prisoner, and every one of his ships—forty in number—were either captured or destroyed. The ship in which the military chest was stored sank, with many others, some of them disappearing in the mighty waters with their flags flying. This was a heavy blow to King Edward and the English nation; and it did not come alone. Ill successes followed each other in rapid succession. No great battles were fought, for it was the policy of Charles to avoid a general engagement with the English. Even when the great Du Guesclin, the constable of France, was appointed leader of his armies, he did not swerve from that policy. It was in vain that the English, under Sir Robert Knowles, penetrated to the walls of Paris to tempt the French to an encounter in the open field; and that the duke of Lancaster, who had returned to the conflict, scoured the country from one end to the other in the hope of striking a blow: the French always avoided them. They had a wholesome dread of meeting the brave English archers. They were ready to harass their march by skirmishes, but would never venture to fight in any general engagement. The lessons taught at Cressy and Poictiers were not lost upon them. Still, wherever the English banner was displayed, the French, under the constable, Du Guesclin, hovered around them to cut off every straggler. In the year 1372, many towns were also taken by that consummate general. For a time the fortune of war seemed to lie within the walls of Thouars, which was besieged by him. Being hard pressed, its garrison capitulated to surrender at Michaelmas, if not relieved previously by the English king or one of his sons. On hearing of this, Edward set sail with a powerful army, but the winds were contrary, and after nine weeks' contention with the waves of the sea, he returned to England. Thouars fell before the engines and arms of Du Guesclin, and in the year 1373 other towns shared the same fate. With the exception of a few places, all Ponthieu was lost to the English.

Throughout this year the duke of Lancaster had been marching and countermarching in search of a French army that would offer him battle. He ravaged the provinces of Artois and Picardy, and he traversed Champagne, Burgundy, and Auvergne; but towards Christmas he returned to Bordeaux without having besieged a single town or fought a single action. As his army was greatly shattered, John of Gaunt concluded a truce with the duke of Anjou; but he had no sooner left Bordeaux than Charles broke the armistice. The greatest part of Guienne was reduced. Not one of all Edward's allies proved faithful to his cause, except young De Montfort, who still defied the French party under De Clisson in Brittany. Everywhere else the French were successful. By the year 1374, indeed, the French king had gained almost all he could hope to get, and as Edward had lost all hope of recovering what his rival had wrested from him, a treaty was commenced at Bruges. A truce was finally concluded for one year, which was subsequently prolonged to the 1st of April, A.D. 1377, a date at which the Black Prince and King Edward had both passed off the stage of life. All that remained of the possessions surrendered by the treaty of Bretigny when this truce was concluded, was Bordeaux, Bayonne, some few towns on the Dordogne, and Calais: a costly purchase, when it is considered that Edward had, in his wild dream of ambition, been spending the blood and treasures of his kingdom during the long period of forty years to obtain that limited dominion. Too much of France had, by the treaty of Bretigny, been surrendered to the English; and it is no wonder that, as the feelings of nationality had been aroused by its concessions, the French fought on until the victories of Cressy and Poictiers left only barren laurels to the conquerors.

That Edward felt his reverses there can be no question. Aged as he was, he still hoped to take the field against the French when the truce expired, in order to redeem his fortunes. In April, A.D. 1376, he summoned a parliament to obtain supplies; but he now met with no response to his demands. On his return to England, the Black Prince had embraced a course of opposition in parliament, but the state of his health had obliged him to seek rest and retirement. The duke of Lancaster then monopolised the authority of government, the king having, after the death of Queen Philippa, become indolent in matters of state. The faithful wife of his boyhood, manhood, and age was soon forgotten by Edward: he became a slave to the young and beautiful Alice Perrers, a married woman, who had been one of the ladies of the queen's bedchamber. He was so captivated by this syren, that he refused her nothing: he even adorned her person with the late queen's jewels, which her vanity induced her to wear in public, to the great scandal of the nation. It was while matters were in

tate that Edward called the parliament above med. It is said that the Black Prince once appeared in public on this occasion, and that easures adopted in parliament were under his ion. Be that as it may, in reply to Edward's d for money, the members, through the speaker, ined of taxation, venality, and corruption, and shed nearly all the king's ministers. Lord er and others were imprisoned for embezzling iblic treasures and other misdemeanors. Nor rliament stop here. It was an age of chivalry the fair sex was universally adored; but ss Alice Perrers had become an object of popular , and she, too, fell under the censures of this nent. She was accused of having "pursued and actions in the king's courts by way of nance for hire and reward." It is said that ss Alice was banished the kingdom; but if so, ntence does not appear to have been carried ecution, for it seems clear that she was with g in his last moments.

Black Prince did not long survive these trans- in parliament. He died on Trinity Sunday, h of June. He was so popular with the h people, that his death, though long expected, l great lamentation. His renown was deemed so intimately associated with the glory of his y, that it was said "the fortunes of England ied in his health, languished in his sickness, pired in his death." He was the object of al love and admiration. Had he lived, it is le that he would have become the most popular h that had ever reigned over England. So was he venerated, that parliament followed him tomb in Canterbury Cathedral, and petitioned g to introduce his only surviving son, Richard of ux, who was in the tenth year of his age, them, that he might receive the honours due as heir apparent to the crown. That request anted; the young prince was presented to the uses by the archbishop of Canterbury, as "the d perfect image of his father." Richard was Prince of Wales, and was invested with all his honours and possessions.

TOMB, CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL.

The duke of Lancaster now became all-powerful in parliament. That parliament met on the 27th of January, and it was opened by the young Prince of Wales by commission from the king, who was indisposed. In this assembly the duke of Lancaster had an overwhelming majority. His own steward, Sir Thomas Hungerford, was appointed speaker in the House of Commons, and the late speaker, Sir Peter de la Mare, who had led the opposition headed by the late Prince of Wales, was imprisoned, while William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, was deprived of his see, and dismissed from court. It was demanded by some, both in the lords and commons, that in right of the Great Charter, they should be put on their trial or liberated, but the demand was rejected. So great was the influence of John of Gaunt, that a petition was drawn up to implore the king to free Alice Perrers, the Lord Latimer, and others, from the censures and restrictions passed upon them by the late parliament. As for the bench of bishops, the duke of Lancaster cared little for them. This was the age of John Wycliffe, the great reformer; and at this time he was cited to appear before a convocation at St. Paul's, to answer for his "heresies." John of Gaunt espoused his cause in opposition to the persecuting prelates. When Wycliffe appeared before this convocation, over which Courtenay, the bishop of London, presided, the duke stood at his side to support him. So, also, did the duke's sworn friend, Lord Percy, marshal of England. The cathedral was crowded with the populace. On this occasion, there was a violent altercation which led to a riot. It is more than probable that bishop Courtenay was severe in his examination of Wycliffe; otherwise Lancaster's conduct can scarcely be accounted for. In the heat of passion, he threatened to drag the prelate out of the cathedral by the hair of his head. This insult was fiercely resented by the Londoners. A riot ensued, in which an unlucky priest was murdered in mistake for Lord Percy, and John of Gaunt's palace in the Savoy was attacked and gutted. The alarm caused by this riot was universal. While it raged, all business in parliament was at a standstill. When order was restored it again assembled, and the question of war with France was the great subject of debate—the truce being on the eve of expiration. All efforts to bring about a lasting peace had proved abortive, and an aid was granted for the support of war in the shape of a poll-tax: a precedent which in the next reign was followed with disastrous consequences. This tax imposed a shilling a head on all beneficed clergymen, and fourpence on every one else in the kingdom, male or female, above fourteen years of age, beggars only excepted.

At this time Edward, whose life had been spent in war, longed for peace. He had in February completed the fiftieth year of his reign. He was growing old, and his health was declining. The work of this warrior monarch was done. He could no longer hope to lead his forces to battle; and as his successor was a mere boy, he did not wish to leave him involved in a war with the wily Charles of France. But the French king felt that this was a golden opportunity of making a good bargain for peace, and the more anxious Edward showed himself to be to obtain that

blessing for his successor, the higher became his demands. There was no satisfying him; and so on the 1st of April, the truce expired without coming to any terms. Nothing, indeed, could be concluded before Edward's death, which took place on the 10th of June. He died at his beautiful manor of Shene, near Richmond, attended only by mistress Alice Perrers. In his dotage, his ministers and courtiers had forsaken him, and were either crowding round John of Gaunt, or the young Prince of Wales and his mother, "the fair maid of Kent." And even mistress Alice Perrers did not stay at Shene to witness his death, for having taken a valuable ring from his finger, she abandoned the once mighty king in his dying moments. One only was present at that death —a priest who stood over him with a crucifix till he was no more. His last hours are well described by the poet Gray in these animated lines:—

"A mighty victor, mighty lord,
Low on his funeral couch he lies!
No pitying heart, no eye afford
A tear to grace his obsequies.
Is the sable warrior fled?
Thy son is gone. He rests among the dead.
The swarm that in thy noontide beams were born,
Gone to salute the rising morn."

Some historians consider the reign of Edward III. to have been the most glorious in the British annals. This may be true, if the glory of a nation depends upon war and victory. At his death his rival, Charles of France, declared that he had reigned nobly and valiantly, and that his name ought to be ranked among heroes. Edward was certainly one of the greatest warriors England had then produced. His personal courage was undoubted, and in martial exercises few surpassed him. It was his heroism and his martial accomplishments that made him a favourite with his subjects. His reign was the golden age of chivalry, and all men were smitten by its false glare. It was in honour of chivalry that Edward founded the celebrated Order of the Garter. That was in the year 1349, when he had just returned from the great victory of Cressy and the capture of Calais. But notwithstanding the glory which Edward won in the field of battle by his chivalrous spirit, his military career impoverished his country. Not only were the services of the ablest part of its population withdrawn from it by war, but heavy taxation was necessitated for its support. And his wars, were they justifiable? If those waged against either France or Scotland are examined by the strict rules of morality, they will be found wanting; and if by their final issue, they will be found to be well nigh worthless. For while he inflicted infinite mischief on both kingdoms, and raised the martial fame of England to a height never before reached, it was at an awful expense of blood and treasures; and all that was left in his hands when his wars were over, of all his many conquests, were Calais and Berwick. Yet many blessings arose out of King Edward's ambition for conquest. His frequent want of money to carry out his ambitious designs compelled him to increase the privileges of the burgesses and lower classes—sections of the community that had been grievously oppressed by former monarchs. It was in his reign that the commons were allowed first to form a distinct legislative body; the Knights of the Shire being separated from the barons to sit with the burgesses or citizens—a measure by which the Lower House of Parliament gained great additional influence. It must also be recorded, to the honour of King Edward, that he was a magnificent patron of literature and learning. One of his measures had the effect of improving the English language. From the period of the Conquest, the French language had been used in all law proceedings; but in the year 1362 it was ordained that for the future the Saxon or English should be used. This encouraged the people to cultivate the native language, and authors to adopt it in their writings. Treatises on, and translations of, the Scriptures were written in English, and dispersed abroad for the spiritual welfare of the people. It was, perhaps, in consequence of this that abuses in the Church of Rome began to attract the popular attention; and that both rich and poor became more desirous of obtaining the blessings of civil and religious liberty. While, therefore, the reign of Edward III. may be considered glorious for "deeds of arms," it must be held to be more glorious for the many benefits which a merciful Providence ordained, should, in spite of war and bloodshed, arise out of his ambitious rule.

During the reign of King Edward, the chief events in the history of Scotland are embodied in his narrative. After its King David Bruce had been set at liberty, A.D. 1367, he paid frequent visits to the English court. He stands charged with being engaged in intrigues with that court in order to set aside the succession of his nephew, Robert the Stuart, who had been regent during his captivity. Walsingham relates that after one of those visits, A.D. 1363, he made a proposal to his parliament at Scone, that if he died without issue, Lionel, duke of Clarence, the second son of King Edward, should be their king. It can scarcely be supposed that David could hope to obtain the consent of his parliament to such a proposal. If he did, his hope was soon cut off. His parliament rejected it with indignation, and made a solemn declaration that no English prince should reign over them, and that they would support the settlement of the crown, which had been made by a former parliament, on the Stuart and his family. His proposal created civil commotions; but, undeterred by the manner in which it had been met by his subjects, David is said to have continued his intrigues with King Edward to set aside the succession of his nephew; but as the Scots were resolutely bent on defending their independence, they were kept secret. If the two kings *were* plotting thus together, it was of no avail. David Bruce died A.D. 1371, and Robert the Stuart, the first of that family, ascended his throne.

SECTION V.

RICHARD II., SURNAMED OF BORDEAUX.

When Edward III. was within a few hours of his mortal agony, and while his bed was deserted by all but one poor priest, there was a scene at Kingston-upon-Thames. Before his grandson, a beautiful boy, there was a solemn deputation. The citizens of

London had sent that deputation to the boy prince of eleven years of age, to offer him their support of his right to the crown, and to invite him to take up his residence in the Tower. Accordingly, on the 22nd of June, Richard, now no longer Prince of Wales, but a king, made his triumphal entry into London. Great was the joy on this occasion. There were pageants and devices in every street; and conduits overflowed with wine. Not only courtiers, but the people universally hailed "the rising morn."

The remains of Edward III. were interred in Westminster Abbey, and several days were devoted to his obsequies. But the solemn funeral rites were scarcely over, when shouts of joy echoed round the walls of that self-same abbey. On the 16th of July, the boy king was there crowned with unusual magnificence; and there his uncles, prelates, barons, and knights, knelt humbly before him and paid him homage. It must have been a very remarkable scene. Not often do we read in history of grey-bearded warriors and aged prelates bowing before a king in his teens. Yet such was the case at Richard's accession. It was a novel sight, and it is recorded that the ceremony was so exciting and fatiguing to the youthful monarch, that he was obliged to be carried in a litter to his apartment to obtain some rest. But the coronation was followed by a banquet, and the young king again appeared among his exulting subjects. At that banquet he created four earls and nine knights, so that he was made to feel that, child as he was in years, he was "every inch a king." Every pains, indeed, appear to have been taken to spoil this "beautiful son of the idol of the people;" and it is scarcely to be wondered at that his mind became impregnated with an idea of irresponsible greatness. There were "such adulations and prostrations as had never before been witnessed in England." Prelates and courtiers spoke of him as a miracle of wisdom and heroism, and for a time the young king became what his father had been—the people's idol. As it was apprehended that the duke of Lancaster meditated supplanting his nephew, it is probable that some of the circumstances attending his accession were designed to blight his hopes of success. At all events, care was taken to deprive him of all undue power in the state. No regency was appointed; but only a temporary council, in which he took no part. The duke, indeed, with his two brothers, Edmund, earl of Cambridge, and Thomas, earl of Buckingham, and afterwards duke of Gloucester, constituted this temporary council; but though John of Gaunt made no resistance to the arrangement, he retired quietly to his castle at Kenilworth, from which it was suspected that he still aimed at the throne.

The season of Richard's accession was one of impending danger. The truce with France had expired, and Charles had renewed hostilities. He had sent armies into Guienne, Brittany, and the marshes of Calais. Two forts of Calais had been captured. England itself was threatened. A French fleet plundered the Isle of Wight, and burnt the town of Hastings. Attempts were made upon Winchelsea and Southampton, but they were successfully resisted. By sea, the French, with some freebooting allies, caused great loss to English commerce by the capture of several merchant ships. It was in the midst of these dangers, that the parliament assembled in October. As the country was deemed to be in danger, supplies were readily voted. They were voted for a twofold purpose: to defray the expenses of a foreign armament, and of naval and land forces to protect the kingdom. The aid granted on this occasion was two-fifteenths from the counties, and two-tenths from the cities and boroughs; added to which, was a subsidy on wool. The fleet was placed under the command of the earl of Buckingham, who proved unequal to the task assigned him, and his failure added to the unpopularity of the Lancastrian party. But before the earl of Buckingham took the command of the fleet, the decline of Lancaster's power had been made more manifest than ever. In this parliament, at the request of the commons, a permanent council of nine persons was appointed by the lords in the king's name, to act as his counsellors in the conduct of government, so that John of Gaunt was more than ever excluded from undue power in the state. This is no wonder, for the members of the House of Commons at this period were the very men who had driven his party from office in A.D. 1376, and his old enemy, Sir Peter de la Mare, was again speaker of that house. As the country, however, was in danger, the commons asked for the aid of twelve peers, with John of Gaunt at their head, to consider how the honour and safety of the country might best be secured. The duke very properly urged that, as they had charged him with treason, and had not brought him face to face with his accusers, they had no claim upon him either for advice or assistance; but, nevertheless, a reconciliation took place, though without any immediate increase to the duke's power. On the contrary, at the request of the commons, two citizens of London, William Walworth and John Philpot, were appointed to receive and to disburse the supplies voted for the defence of the country: an office never before held by the citizens of London. In this same parliament, also, Alice Perrers, who had been favoured by John of Gaunt, was sentenced to be banished and her estates confiscated.

The country, however, could not finally dispense with John of Gaunt's warlike services. In the year 1378, he was appointed commander of the fleet. One detachment of his squadron took possession of Cherbourg, on the coast of Normandy, which was ceded to England by the king of Navarre, who was again at war with Charles of France; and another fleet, which he had hired at Bayonne, while sailing to England, captured fourteen ships richly laden, belonging to a fleet of Spanish merchantmen. The duke himself sailed with the great body of his fleet, to Brittany. Brest was ceded to him by the young duke of Brittany—de Montfort—who was at this period hard pressed by the French forces. John of Gaunt then invested St. Malo; but the constable, Du Guesclin, marched against him with a superior force, and compelled him to retire. He returned to his ships and sailed home. He had done nothing beyond taking possession by friendly treaty of Cherbourg and Brest; and although this was of great advantage, by depriving France of two ports whence they could best attack England,

and giving the English two valuable keys to France, it was held that his expedition was fruitless. The cost and general failure of this enterprise produced general discontent.

Nearer home there had been war by land and sea. Taking advantage of the war with France, the Scots had renewed hostilities. Roxburgh was burnt and Berwick captured. The great border fortress, however, was soon recaptured by the earl of Northumberland, and all the Scots, except their leader, put to the sword. But the most popular exploit of this year was by sea. It was performed by "a worshipful citizen of London." One, John Mercer, had collected some ships, and had manned them with French, Scots, and Spaniards, who under his command sailed to Scarborough, and made prize of every ship in that port. It seems to have been an independent expedi-

SCARBOROUGH.

tion, undertaken solely for the benefit of John Mercer and his motley crew. There could be no harm, therefore, in a private individual taking up the cudgels on his country's behalf. So thought the patriotic John Philpot, the "worshipful citizen of London." Manning some ships at his own expense, Philpot boldly sailed in quest of the marauders. He found them, and there was a fierce sea battle between the bold alderman of London and the marauding Scot. John Mercer was taken prisoner, and fifteen of his ships were captured. Philpot returned triumphantly to London with his prizes, and his fellow-citizens greeted him on his return as a hero. But not so did the council of Government. He was censured for his heroic act, because it had been done without authority! But though the nobles censured, the people applauded, and the council was compelled to drop the subject.

The parliament met at Gloucester in October. More money in aid of the war was wanted. The commons, however, were not in a mood to grant it willingly. There must, they conceived, still be money in the treasury. But the dispute was compromised. On condition of their being allowed to inspect the accounts of the treasurer, and of being put in possession of documents, showing how the moneys they had voted had been raised and spent, they granted an aid of additional taxes on wool, wo hides, leather, and other merchandize.

The expedition of the duke of Lancaster t tany, had been followed by the loss of all that except Brest. John de Montfort had taken ref England, and the French king had annexed B to the crown of France. But this act, which to extinguish the last hopes of the young and duke, was the means of restoring him to his sions. The annexation of Brittany to the cr France was impolitic on the part of Charles Bretons were averse to De Montfort's attachm England, and had aided the French on that s in expelling him; but they had a perfect di subjection to the French power. All the facti the country became united, and John de M was recalled by the unanimous voices of his su On his return, with a few troops, A.D. 1379, St opened its gates at his approach. The very who had aided in expelling him, with others wh steadily adhered to his cause, rushed into the w meet him, and the people everywhere receive with shouts of welcome. All the chief places dominions were restored to him. But this was a signal for a renewal of the war. It was in va the states implored the king of France to permi to retain their prince: Charles prepared to s army into Brittany.

As De Montfort had hitherto proved a faithfi of England, it was resolved to send an army aid. At a parliament held at Westmins January, A.D. 1380, the commons, after appo commissioners to examine into every part administration, again voted supplies for war. earl of Buckingham was this time sent to the De Montfort. At the head of a large ar marched from Calais in July, and passed th Picardy, Champagne, and other provinces of I plundering and destroying without meetin enemy to oppose him. He entered Britta triumph, but he had scarcely arrived there, news arrived of the death of the king of Fran as the Bretons knew that a boy was about to the throne, they conceived they should no require the aid of the English. All their old and jealousy revived, and many of the cities re to shut their gates against Buckingham and his De Montfort still desired to maintain his alliance England, but at the same time, the aversion his subjects entertained towards the English pelled him to think of making peace with I His conduct at this time savours of double de for while he sent commissioners to Paris to p an accommodation, he sent some of his no Buckingham, to congratulate him on his arri Brittany, and to propose an interview with hin that interview, which took place at Meziare Rennes, it was agreed that the English should take the siege of Nantes; De Montfort promis join them in a few weeks. Buckingham in Nantes, and continued the siege for two month when he found that the Bretons did not app raised the siege, and retired to Vannes, into quarters. He had been shamefully deceived, January, A.D. 1381, De Montfort had conclu

treaty of peace with France: a treaty in which he engaged to renounce his alliance with England, and to send home the English army which had been sent for his defence. The earl of Buckingham returned moody and discontented. His expedition was barren of honour, and its charges proved fatal to the internal peace of the kingdom.

The cost of this expedition had been great. Large sums had also been expended in maintaining the garrisons of Calais, Bordeaux, and Bayonne. The nation was harassed with taxation, and by the way in which the taxes had been levied. Added to all this was the mortifying circumstance that no effective operations resulted from the vast expenditure. There was, therefore, much discontent throughout the country. But heavily as the people had been taxed, more money was wanted, and must be procured. At the close of the year 1380, Buckingham's army was in Brittany, in danger of starvation, for the Bretons refused to afford them any supplies. Money, also, was required for other purposes. The parliament of last January had requested that there might not be another called for at least a year; but the exigencies of the state were so great that one was summoned to meet at Northampton on the 5th of November. Supplies were demanded, and there were earnest deliberations, and several conferences between the two houses, as to what tax or taxes should be imposed. Had this parliament deliberately consulted as to what impost should be put into force which would work mischief in the land, they could not have devised one better adapted for that purpose than that on which, after much thought and care, they consented. In an evil hour, a capitation or poll-tax was granted. Every person in the kingdom whether male or female—beggars excepted—who was of the age of fifteen years and upwards, was to pay three groats; but it was ordained that in cities and towns the aggregate amount should be divided among the inhabitants, according to their abilities; no individual paying less than one or more than sixty groats for himself and wife. As there was no certain registration to guide the collector as to age, such a tax was pregnant with causes for dispute. A boy or a girl of fourteen might be taken for fifteen; and as the tax was in itself obnoxious, parents might be induced to understate the age of children legally liable. According to the chroniclers of the event about to be related, it was the pressure of the tax upon the poor, and the brutal manner in which it was enforced, that gave rise to that event; but in strict truth, these were only as the match to the mine, for the explosive materials had for some years been accumulating.

A great change had been gradually taking place, not only in England but throughout Europe. Everywhere the peasantry, who had for ages been treated as slaves, had been preparing to strike a blow for freedom. They were ambitious of becoming men among their fellow-men, and of being treated as such by their superiors in rank and wealth. At this very time, the populace of Flanders, headed by Philip von Arteveldt, the son of the famous brewer of Ghent, and Peter du Bois, was waging a successful war against the aristocracy; and the peasantry had again risen in France against the nobles, and were committing frightful excesses. No doubt the condition of the English peasantry was superior to that either of France or Flanders; but it was, notwithstanding, very deplorable. As a rule they were still serfs or "villains," bound to the soil, and sold or transmitted with the estates, of which the law still held them to be a part. There were few, except the lower order of the clergy, who treated them as fellow-creatures; so that as a body they might still be considered to be in bondage. And that bondage was now bitter to them. As they grew more enlightened, they bore their yoke with greater impatience. They were bound to unlimited services at the will of their masters; could acquire no property by their industry; and had no remedy against the tyranny of their masters—except for the highest crimes. But the system of villanage had long been tottering to its fall. In all ages of the world oppressed peoples have struck for freedom, and so it was at this time in England. In the first parliament of this reign, complaints were made that in many parts of the realm, the "villains" were withholding their services and customs to their lords: asserting that they were, by certain clauses in the Book of Doomsday, respecting the manors and towns where they resided, discharged of all manner of serfage, due as well of their body as their tenures. Their interpretation of these clauses was pronounced "evil," and it was ordered that their proceedings should be put down by special commissions. But it was not only the "villains" who resisted their lords in claiming "the franchise of their bodies:" the land tenants were at this time seeking to change the position of their tenure and customs "of old times due." The discontent was even more general. From a statute passed in this same parliament against "liveries," it may be gathered that divers people of small properties were making great retinues of people, as well as of esquires as of others in many parts of the kingdom; giving to them hats and other liveries, of one suit by year, "taking of them the value of the same livery or perchance the double value by such covenant and assurance that every one of them shall maintain the other in all quarrels." Thus, when the poll-tax was levied, serfs, petty tenants in villanage and freemen of small revenue, were banding together to obtain their civil rights. Citizens and burghers had for the most part become free from feudal exactions, and serfs who had lived in corporate towns for a certain time had obtained their freedom; and the cultivators, whether yeomen, tenants, or labourers, were forming a resolution to be free likewise. But had it not been for the poll-tax, years might have passed before any commotion had taken place; for that unwise measure must be considered as the proximate cause of the sanguinary crisis which accompanied its levy.

The tax was levied at first with moderation. It was, however, soon found that its collection fell short of the required supply. Not that government would have suffered from the deficiency, for it was farmed out to some courtiers who raised money upon it from Flemish and Lombard merchants. It was the courtiers, therefore, who would have suffered from the deficiency; or rather the merchants to whom they had mortgaged the proceeds. Hence when it was discovered that the

receipts would not reach the amount expected from the tax, the collectors were urged to exact it with greater severity. But the more severe they were, the more they were opposed. In many of the rural districts payment was generally refused, and the recusants were roughly treated. This was especially the case in various places in Kent, Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk. In the two former counties, the rough usage of the collectors was sternly resented. Some were slain, others were wounded, and the rest fled. Matters grew worse daily. The government was defied, and commissioners were sent into the disturbed districts to enforce the levy. One of these commissioners sat at Brentwood, in Essex: he had two serjeants-at-arms with him, and thus supported he summoned the people of Fobbing before him. But the people of Fobbing were not to be frightened by Thomas de Bampton and his men-at-arms. They still refused to pay any more than they had done, and orders were given to arrest them. This only increased resistance. The Essex peasantry drove the commissioner and his men-at-arms to London. The chief justice of the common pleas was sent to Brentwood, to try those who had been arrested, but he was not allowed to sit in judgment. He was compelled to flee, and the jurors and clerks of the commission were beheaded. Mischief was now fairly afloat. With the heads of the murdered men stuck upon poles, the Essex peasantry went from town to town, calling upon all of their order to join them. The mob was triumphant. Sir Robert Hales, Lord Treasurer of England, had "a goodly and delectable manor in Essex," and they broke into his house, and after consuming all the provisions in his larder, and drinking all the wine in his cellar, they burnt his mansion to the ground.

All that the "Commons of England"—for that was the name assumed by the riotous peasantry—now wanted was a leader. As previously stated, the lower clergy were friends of the peasantry, and one of them now stood boldly forward to aid them in their insurrection. Under the assumed and ridiculous name of Jack Straw, a priest became their leader. In a brief space of time, all the rural population of Essex, Kent, Norfolk, and Suffolk rose in arms. In Kent the spirit of revolt was incited by the brutal conduct of a collector. This man went into the house of Walter the Tyler—or Wat Tyler as he was familiarly called—and demanded a tax for his daughter. The mother said she was under age, upon which he declared that he would ascertain the fact, and at once proceeded to offer a gross insult to the maiden. Both mother and daughter cried out, and the father being within hearing, rushed to the spot, and with one fell blow of a hammer, struck the ruffian dead. Wat Tyler's neighbours applauded the deed, and promised to stand by him. He became the champion of the "Commons of Kent." They flocked to him from all quarters, and Wat Tyler prepared for action. The Kentish peasantry were further exasperated by an act committed by Sir Thomas Burley, who with an armed force went to Gravesend and claimed a burgher as his "villain." By law, if a villain had resided a year and a day in a town, he acquired his freedom. Such was the condition in which this burgher stood: but, notwithstanding, he was carried as a prisoner to Rochester Castle. Enraged at this act, Wat Tyler and his followers crossed the Thames, took the castle of Rochester, and liberated the burgher. The insurgents now marched to Maidstone, where they released from gaol an itinerant preacher named John Ball, who was under prosecution for "preaching errors, and schisms, and scandals, against the pope, the archbishops, bishops, and clergy."

The "Commons of Essex" had joined the "Commons of Kent" in their attacks upon Rochester Castle and Maidstone gaol, and with Wat Tyler as their captain, John Ball as their chaplain, and Jack Straw, who appears to have acted as secretary, the combined forces entered Canterbury. At Canterbury they frightened the monks and clergy of the cathedral almost to death. It would have been well if they had done nothing more; but from some cause or other they beheaded three rich citizens. They then proceeded towards London; their numbers hourly increasing on their march. When they reached Blackheath, the insurgents are said to have amounted to one hundred thousand men. The revolt had then assumed a most formidable character. It extended from the coast of Kent to the Humber, and was organised in a remarkable manner by correspondence in letters and messages: chiefly under the direction of the "riotous priest," Jack Straw. The letters bore the signatures of Jack Milner, Jack Carter, Jack Trueman, and John Ball; all splendid names to be recorded in the pages of history. At Blackheath, the renowned John Ball harangued the multitude. It is said that he composed his own text; that famous couplet:—

> When Adam delved, and Eve span,
> Who was then the gentleman?

From such a text it is easy to suppose that Ball insisted that as all men were equal in the sight of God, they ought to be so in the view of the laws. This was a legitimate proposition; but Ball went further. He preached destruction to the upper classes, and an equable division of property. This was a dangerous doctrine to urge upon an ignorant multitude with weapons in their hands. It was mob oratory with a vengeance, and inflamed by it, the insurgents proceeded to plunder and destroy. But a little instance of gallantry must be accorded to the infuriated multitude. While at Blackheath, the widow of the Black Prince fell into their hands, and after granting a few kisses to some of them, she was allowed, with her retinue and maids of honour, to proceed on their journey in safety. The memory of her husband, the idol of the people, saved her from violence and outrage. But this little episode of gallantry was succeeded by fearful episodes of vengeance. Every road on the Blackheath side of London was occupied by the insurgents, so that no one could pass through their ranks into or from the city without their permission. No judge or lawyer was allowed this privilege, for every one on whom they could lay their hands was slain without mercy. As for the other passengers, they were made to take an oath that they would be true to "King Richard and the Commons;" that they would never be ruled by a king whose name was John; and that they

y no tax except the fifteenth paid by their s. Having taken this oath, they were) pass on. In his extremity, the young king er with his mother and a few of his coun- the Tower. On their way to London, the s had seized several knights and gentlemen y obliged to accompany them; and one of ghts was sent to the king, in the Tower, to n to come and speak with them concerning nment of his kingdom. Accordingly, on the une, Richard sailed in his barge to Rother- seeing which, says Froissart, they set up ible cries, that it seemed as if all the devils ere in their company, and terrified thereat, ; companions rowed back with all speed to r. Then arose a loud cry for the heads of inisters. Had Richard been permitted to nraged multitude might have been appeased.) was now no hope of arresting the swell- of mischief. It is impossible to describe of the Kentish insurgents when they found king had been rowed back to the Tower. it Southwark and Lambeth was a scene of dismay. Houses were burnt to the ground, ' gentleman on whom they could lay their is summarily beheaded. The Marshalsea King's Bench were demolished, and the the primate sacked. Nor were the men of). Advancing along the left bank of the r destroyed the lord treasurer's mansion at , and threatened the north-east of London. ext day, the gate on London Bridge, which shut, was opened by the mob within, and ents poured into the heart of the city. The s of the period record that at first they eable: that they injured neither person nor and purchased what they required at a just ; the same time they record, that the rich ı the hope of conciliating them, threw their ırs open, that they might drink without l without price, and that when once they the rare luxury, they seized it with other inks wherever it could be found. The of drunkenness re-excited their fury. The ıce of the Savoy with all its rich furniture, to the duke of Lancaster, was destroyed by gate was demolished, and its prisoners set vell their numbers, and the Temple, with luable and ancient records, was razed to the So also was the priory of St. John of Jeru- ently erected in Clerkenwell. It does not it plunder formed any part of the object of gents; except strong drinks. On the con- leaders made proclamation, that whoever rete any plate, gold, or jewels, in the Savoy uld be put to death, and one man thus paid ty of his disobedience to their will. De- not plunder, was the object of the "Com- ngland." And that now again extended to very man they met they put this question, m holdest thou?" and if the answer given n the language of their watchword, "For ard and the Commons," they were put to any of the citizens thus perished, and the ie involved in fire, murder, and debauchery. As the Flemings and Lombards were held to have grown rich at the expense of the English peasantry, the vengeance of the insurgents was especially directed towards them. Every one they could find in the city was beheaded: even the altar afforded them no protection, for many were dragged from thence and slain in the streets. The destruction of life was fearful, and had not the greater part of them been overcome with liquor, it would have been still greater. All London was at their mercy, for the efforts of government to check their career were, by the suddenness and extent of the revolt, paralyzed.

During this fearful day the king still remained in the Tower. As night advanced Walworth, lord mayor of London, proposed that the garrison should rush out upon the rioters when buried in sleep and wine, and put them to the sword. This dangerous proposition was overruled. It was resolved rather that the king should endeavour to prevail upon them by fair speeches, and granting them all their demands to retire to their homes. But this was only a measure of expediency. The court had no intention of keeping faith with the insurgents: promises were only to be made; not observed. On the morning of the 14th of June, therefore, as the multitude assembled round the Tower—some demanding an audience, and others the heads of the chancellor and treasurer—they were told that if they would retire to Mile End, the king would meet them there and hear their demands. The great body of the rioters complied with this message, and the king, with a few attendants, rode from the Tower to meet them. But they did not all go. Wat Tyler and Jack Straw, with many of their most furious followers, lingered behind, and no sooner was Richard fairly on his way to Mile End than they forced an entrance into the Tower, where they beheaded the archbishop of Canterbury; Sir Robert Hales, the treasurer; Apuldore, the king's confessor; and Leggo, with three others who had made themselves obnoxious for their connection with the farming of the poll-tax. The king's mother was still safe in their hands. Bloodthirsty as they were, the insurgents offered her no violence; but the scene was so appalling that she fell into a swoon, in which state she was rowed across the Thames, and carried to a house in the city.

It was chiefly by the men of Essex and Hertfordshire that the king was met at Mile End. Their behaviour was mild and respectful, and their demands moderate and just. They required the abolition of slavery throughout England; the reduction of rent of land to fourpence an acre; liberty to buy and sell in all markets and fairs throughout England; and a general amnesty for past offences. Although, therefore, John Ball had preached destruction to all distinction of rank, and an equable division of property, and the great body of the insurgents had been carried away by his oratory, better thoughts now prevailed among the men of Essex and Hertfordshire. One cannot but be struck with their moderation at Mile End, when compared with their fury in the city. As it has been observed, slavery was an unnatural condition, and at this period, when it was gradually passing away, and could not long be maintained, particularly galling; to limit the rent of land to fourpence an acre, which at that time was about the

average rental, if absurd, was not more so than the laws which limited the rate of wages, and fixed the rate of provisions; and to claim a right to buy and sell in all markets and fairs, was to assert a freedom of commercial intercourse, to which all subjects in all ages of the world are fairly entitled. On the whole, therefore, the demands made were for just and natural rights: rights which had been accorded to burgesses, and which ought long ago to have been extended to the peasantry. Whether the young king was struck with their justice may be questioned, but he readily agreed to them. Clerks were employed the remaining hours of the day, and all the succeeding night, in drawing up charters in accordance with the demands for every township and parish, and when, on the next morning, the king's seal was affixed to them, the men of Essex and Hertfordshire returned home, loyal subjects.

But the men of Kent were not so easily pacified. They rejected the charter, and when other terms were offered still more liberal they failed to satisfy them. Under their redoubtable leader, Wat Tyler, they carried on their ravages in and about London as before. Deeply impregnated with John Ball's doctrine of equality, *they* designed to level all distinctions with the dust. It is related that they resolved to seize the king and destroy all the nobility. Success had certainly made them both insolent and ferocious. On the morning of the 15th, the king left the wardrobe and went to hear mass and pay his devotions to the statue of "Our Lady"—the special protectress of English kings—at Westminster Abbey. He was accompanied by the lord mayor and some city magistrates, with a few knights and barons—in all about sixty persons mounted on horseback. As he was returning through West Smithfield, he encountered Wat Tyler and his followers. "Here is the king," said Wat; "I will go and speak to him. Move not till I give the signal." He, too, was mounted and armed, and putting spurs to his horse, rode boldly into the midst of Richard's retinue. "King," said he, "dost thou see all those men there?" "I see them," replied the king, "why ask the question?" "Because," rejoined Wat, "they are all of my will: sworn by their faith and loyalty to do my bidding." It is said that during this parley, Wat was playing with his dagger, and seized hold of the king's bridle, but it is absurd to suppose that he meant to murder him in the midst of his retinue. Walworth, the lord mayor, however, chose to believe that he meant mischief, and with one fell blow, either with his sword or mace, struck him to the ground; and Ralph Standish, one of the king's esquires, thrust his sword into his side, and in a few brief moments the insurgents had lost their leader. They prepared for revenge. Already their bows were bent, but Richard, with the heroism of his race, boldly galloped up to them, and exclaimed that Tyler was a traitor, and that he would now be their captain. "Follow me into the fields," he added, "and I will grant you whatever you desire." They followed him as he rode gently on to Islington; but they were betrayed. The citizens had been arming themselves and their servants, and while Richard was holding parley with the rioters in the fields at Islington, they joined him under the command of Sir Robert Knowles, and the insurgents now either ran away through the corn-fields, or fell upon their knees and begged for mercy. He commanded them to return to their homes, nor would he allow them to be molested by the forces gathered around him; but he resolved to have his revenge.

In the meantime, the servile war had extended to other parts of England. At St. Albans several gentlemen were beheaded by a mob, and charters of freedom and manumission were extorted from the abbot and monks; at St. Edmundsbury, Sir John

ST. ALBAN'S ABBEY.

Cavendish, chief justice of England, and others, were massacred; and in Norfolk, a body of peasantry, under the command of John Littister, a dyer of Norwich, who assumed the title of "King of the Commons," created general dismay by their ferocity. This mob carried some lords and gentlemen with them, to give a sanction to their ravages, and other nobles shut themselves up in their castles for fear. Henry Spenser, the fighting bishop of Norwich, however, despised such cowardice. He gathered around him his armed retainers, and marching against the rioters, not only subdued them in Norfolk, but in Cambridge and Huntingdon. Many were slain by his armed band. Others were taken prisoners, and when he had crushed the rebellion in those counties, he combined the sacerdotal with the judicial office; for he took up the crucifix, confessed his captives, and then sentenced them to be beheaded. In other parts the rioters, on hearing of the death of Wat Tyler, and the dispersion of his followers, disbanded and returned to their homes.

The raging storm was followed by a profound calm. That calm was deceitful. There was a tempest of vengeance appearing in the horizon. All the military tenants of the crown were summoned to appear in

RICHARD II. AND WAT TYLER.

horses and arms, and it was so well ichard soon found himself at the head nd horsemen. Their rendezvous was Thus supported, on the 30th of June a vas issued, commanding all tenants in erform their usual services to their) days after letters patent were pub- g the charters of freedom which had The men of Essex, whose conduct had moderate and rational, made a stand ach of the royal faith; but it was use- defeated with great loss. Then fol- commission to condemn the offenders; were a mockery of justice. Among ished were Jack Straw and John Ball, ient was highly deserved. But there nong the several hundred executed— 1500—to whom some mercy might wn. There appears, however, to have mination displayed in this wholesale t first they were beheaded; but after- re hanged and gibbeted, some in irons, cite terror in the minds of the rural lreadful severity, as it has been truly invalidated the proud claim of the o be considered a different race from of the peasant population.

urrection of A.D. 1381 was put down in as violently and illegally as the out- seen by a statute of indemnity passed which shortly after assembled. That ited from blame all those "who made ients upon the said villains and other t due process of the law, and otherwise nd usages of the realm required," in- did it not of malice prepense, but only d cease the mischief. By the same npulsory manumissions and releases null and void. By the advice of his o must have been far-seeing statesmen, tted to this parliament, whether it xpedient to abolish the state of slavery, cord the lords of the soil declared that ver consent to such a measure: thus he upper classes were ill prepared to ights of the peasants. And not only villing to relinquish their cherished ng their fellow-creatures in bondage, lisposed to increase the severity of the them. In this parliament, a law was h "riots and rumours and other such made "high treason:" a vague and , however, which was as likely to affect the lower classes, although it was d for the latter purpose. But while t showed an utter disregard to the lower classes, its members proved that ly alive to their own interests. They tterly of evils which touched them- veyance; of the rapacity of the law intainers of suits who violated right hey were little kings; and of taxation. ifficulty that the king could obtain a s he would not give his consent to the mnity above mentioned without it, the commons at last yielded: a subsidy on wool, wool-fells, and leather was granted for five years. Then it was that Richard granted his pardon to all "loyal subjects," and a few weeks after it was extended to the offending peasantry.

In the year 1382, the king, being in his sixteenth year, was married to Anne of Bohemia, daughter of the late emperor, Charles IV. Anne was an excellent princess, and deserved a better husband than Richard proved to be; but she restrained many of the impulses of his levity, and fitful passions, and, therefore, endeared herself to the nation. Anne became a nursing mother of the reformation by adopting the doctrines of Wycliffe, which she imbibed from her mother-in-law, "the fair maid of Kent," who was the active protectress of the reformer: of whom more will be seen under the section on religion.

From the bravery and prudence which Richard had displayed in the servile insurrection, a glorious reign was anticipated by his subjects. But he did not long persist in this popular course. His uncles, who were engaged in their own ambitious designs, had shamefully neglected his education, and had left him in the hands of young persons who were dissolute, and who corrupted his mind with flattery. He became vain, voluptuous, and extravagant. Henceforth his reign, indeed, presents a series of dark events, obscure intrigues, errors, and calamities. He became a tyrant without the force of character that makes tyranny successful. He was himself ruled by favourites upon whom he was ever ready to confer honours and estates. One of his first unpopular acts was the taking the great seal from Henry Le Scroop, to whom it had been committed with the full approbation of parliament. Scroop refused to affix the seal to certain grants of land which he had made to some of his worthless courtiers, and taking it into his own hands he sealed the grants, and then delivered it to Braybroke, bishop of London: and thus commenced a course of despotism which led to his deposition.

The war with France was not yet over. In a parliament held at Westminster a subsidy was granted for defraying the expenses of that war, and "the other enemies of the kingdom." Two schemes were proposed for prosecuting that war. The duke of Lancaster, titular king of Castile and Leon, proposed to lead an army into Spain; and the fighting bishop of Norwich, who "loved the profession of arms above all things," offered to raise an army of three thousand men-at-arms, and three thousand archers, to assist the Flemings, who were at war with their own prince, aided by the French. No decision was arrived at in this parliament, but in the meantime the French were acting. Philip von Arteveldt, the leader of the patriotic Flemings, had for some time been victorious. With the weavers and other artisans of Ghent, he had defeated the French and the whole chivalry of Flanders. But in the autumn of this year there was a turn in his fortunes. The French had defeated the Flemings at Comines, and again in a great battle fought at Rosebecque, and all Flanders was reduced except Ghent, which was besieged. Philip von Arteveldt was slain. This rapid progress of the French arms, combined with their threatening to besiege Calais, caused great alarm in England. A parliament was

called in February, A.D. 1383, and as the truce was about expiring with Scotland, and the Scots were disposed to renew hostilities, it was not deemed expedient that a royal army should leave the kingdom, but that the proposal of the bishop of Norwich should be accepted. The young king himself seems to have been disposed to go to Flanders, and lead an army in person, but a proposal to that effect was negatived; and it was decided that the honour of England should be entrusted to the warrior prelate.

But although in reality this expedition was undertaken to support the patriotic Flemings against their duke and France, the prelate's troops were ostensibly raised for another purpose: a purpose for which a prelate might be supposed to draw the sword without violating the sacred character of his profession. At this time there was a schism in the church. There were rival popes: Urban VI., an Italian, who had obtained possession of St. Peter's chair at Rome, and Clement VII. a Frenchman, who resided at Avignon. France, Scotland, Spain, Sicily, and Cyprus, were in favour of the Frenchman, and England, Flanders, and the rest of Europe for the Italian. It was a favourable opportunity for the bishop of Norwich to raise troops, however he might employ them after they had rallied round his standard. He preached a crusade against the French pope at Avignon, and lancers and archers rallied round him for his holy war. Part of the cost of his adventure was paid by parliament, and part was raised by voluntary contributions. All the ladies of the land showed their zeal in favour of Urban: for they sent the bishop money and jewels from all quarters for the support of his army. The war, therefore, in which this military churchman engaged, presented two aspects. On the one hand, it was ostensibly a sacred crusade for Pope Urban: on the other, it was a conflict waged in union with, and for the rights and independence of, the burghers and commons of Flanders against the aristocracy. Viewed in the latter light, it must be considered a strange contest for the bishop of Norwich to embark in, as he had been but a few months before exhibiting his prowess against the English peasantry when struggling for *their* rights and independence. But bishop Spenser so loved war, that he does not seem to have cared much about the manner in which he indulged in his fighting propensities. He sailed in May with his lancers and archers to Calais, and soon took the field. At first he was successful in his military operations. He took Gravelines by assault; defeated a French army near Dunkirk, and made himself master of it; then he took possession of several other towns; and, finally, he besieged Ypres. But here his career of success ended. He was joined before Ypres by twenty thousand of the men of Ghent, but a superior French army appeared to contest the palm of victory with him, and on their approach he ran back to the coast faster than he had advanced from it. A part of his army reached the coast in safety, but he threw himself into Gravelines, and the French got rid of him by permitting him to destroy its fortifications, and then to return to England. On his return, the bishop was prosecuted by parliament, and was for some time deprived of his temporalities, while four of his principal officers were condemned for having sold stores and provisions to the enemy: and thus ended the military career of this martial prelate.

The year 1384 is chiefly marked by a struggle between the king's favourites and his uncles. In that year, John of Gaunt concluded a truce with France, in which Scotland was comprehended. But the Scots would not accept the truce. They were meditating an invasion of England, and after the duke had returned from France, he led an army across the borders, and plundered and burnt some towns. Just after the duke had rendered this service to the State, a parliament met at Salisbury, in which John Latimer, a Carmelite friar, accused him of plotting to dethrone the king and usurp the crown. Lancaster asserted his innocence, and demanded that his accuser should be committed to safe custody until he had made good his accusation. He was committed to the charge of Sir John Holland, the king's half-brother, and the next day the friar was found dead in his chamber. It was said that he was strangled by his knightly keeper; but the king's friends asserted that he had committed suicide. Whether he was put out of the way to prevent disclosures against Lancaster, or to conceal the treachery by which he was suborned to accuse the duke falsely, remains a mystery. Richard, however, professed his conviction that his uncle was innocent, and he was again sent abroad to obtain a prolongation of the truce with France. The truce was prolonged till the 1st of May, A.D. 1385, but while John of Gaunt was negotiating with the French court, his enemies were again engaged in plotting his downfall. Before he went on his mission, there had been frequent tumults in London, which were chiefly occasioned by John Northampton, who had recently been mayor. John Northampton *was* a partisan of Lancaster, but it does not appear that the duke was at all connected with him in raising these tumults. In his absence, however, the ex-mayor was brought to trial, and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. His estates were confiscated. Encouraged by this success, the ministers formed a design of bringing the duke himself to trial for treason. Preparations were made for his arrest, but Lancaster secured himself in the castle of Pontefract. There was again a prospect of civil war, but it was prevented for a time by the good offices of the princess of Wales, who brought about a seeming reconciliation between the duke and her son. The storm blew over for a time, but Richard at this period had become an adept in the art of dissimulation, which augured ill for the peace of the kingdom.

The truce which had been prolonged till the month of May, 1385, having expired, France sent a thousand men-at-arms, and advanced a large sum of money to induce the Scots to invade England. This expedition was commanded by Sir John de Vienne. According to Froissart, the Scots and the French did not very well agree. The Scots complained that the French who lodged about in the villages near Edinburgh, would rifle and eat them up, and were not sufficiently respectful to the women; and the French complained of the pride of the Scots, the poverty of the land, and the want of amusement. The Scots said they could do without the French, and asked "what devil had brought them there;" and the French barons and

ıked their admiral "what pleasure had ıem thither." While thus murmuring one ıe other, they were waiting for King d when he came, the French showed him rence. However, the ill-assorted allies— Scots and the gay Frenchmen—marched ınd. But they soon marched back again. ing Newcastle, they learned that King who now, for the first time, took the field, ıcing from York with a large army, and retreated. Richard advanced into Scotland, .e borders, burnt Edinburgh, Perth, and ns; but while he was thus engaged, the ıd Scots had crossed the Solway Frith, and ıg the same destructive part in Westmore- Cumberland. Richard returned to England, the French and Scots re-entered Scotland, ı campaign terminated without any trial of ı battle. Richard disbanded his army, and esult of the war was, that the French and ed England, and the English wasted Scot-

this campaign there had been frequent etween Richard's uncles and his favourites. York, Sir John Holland, a partisan of s, assassinated one of the favourites; and chard's retreat from Scotland, Sir Michael s, another of his minions, who was then , excited fresh jealousy in his mind against John of Gaunt, which led to a fierce altercа- ere were great burnings of heart between and all his relations, in part caused by the ıours which he had recently conferred on ıis favourites. Michael de la Pole was l of Suffolk, and Robert de Vere, marquis of De Vere, also, received the grant of the enue of Ireland, on condition of paying a of five thousand marks to the king. This indeed, was soon after created duke of Ire- order, however, to neutralize the jealousy of the earls of Cambridge and Buckingham, onferred dukedoms upon them; Cambridge duke of York, and Buckingham, duke of . Henry, the son of the duke of Lancaster, ıe same time created earl of Derby, and he son of the duke of York, earl of Rutland; er, earl of March, son of Lionel, the second ward III., was declared presumptive heir to . All these honours and grants were con- a parliament which met in October, and for jealousies between the king's relations and were allayed.

luring this family concord that the duke of was enabled to conduct an army into Spain, his long-cherished claim to the crowns of l Leon. King Richard was glad to get rid nd parliament was scarcely less pleased. were readily voted for the purpose. Cir- s were considered favourable for prosecuting . The reigning king of Castile, John, had ıe only legitimate child of Ferdinand, late ırtugal, and he laid claim to that crown. In ɔbtain it he laid siege to Lisbon. But the e hated the Castilians, and refused to own ir monarch. They placed John, a natural brother of Ferdinand, on the throne, under whose conduct the siege of Lisbon was raised, and a great victory gained over the Castilians at Abjubarata. But John of Portugal still dreaded the power of John of Castile. Accordingly, he entered into an alliance with John of Gaunt, and engaged to assist him with his whole power in obtaining possession of the crowns of Castile and Leon. Encouraged by this event, Lancaster set sail in July with an army of ten thousand men, taking with him his wife Constantia, heiress of Castile, and his three daughters, Philippa, Elizabeth, and Catherine. But Lancaster gained more by matrimonial negotiation in this expedition than he did by the fortune of war. He landed at Corunna, from whence he penetrated through Gallicia into Portugal, where he married Philippa, daughter of his first wife, to King John; and then he made war on the king of Castile, and after some victories, but greater reverses, he gave the hand of his daughter Catherine to Henry, prince of Asturias, who was heir of the reigning king of Castile, whom he had sought to dethrone.

The absence of the duke of Lancaster with his choice warriors, encouraged the French to prepare for an invasion of England. In the hope of revenging the injuries inflicted upon France, great preparations were made for that purpose. In September, A.D. 1386, two fleets were collected for the enterprise, one at Sluys, and another at Tréguier, in Brittany. Ships were collected in all maritime countries, from Cadiz to Dantzic, and such a number had never before been seen in Christendom. And then how gorgeously they were decorated! there were gilded masts, emblazoned sails, and silken banners. The lords of France and Brittany rivalled each other in decorating the ships that were to bear them to the hated coasts of England. For several months knights had been pouring into the towns of Flanders and Artois from all parts of France, to aid in the enterprise. When Charles VI. arrived at Sluys to take part in the expedition, there were upwards of a hundred thousand men, including nearly all the chivalry of France, ready to embark with him, all full of gladness in the prospect of avenging the blood of their fathers and their brethren. Great preparations were made in England to receive the French, but they never came. Charles was ready and eager to sail, but his uncle, the duke of Berri, lingered at Paris till the vast stores collected were nearly all consumed, and the bold Flemings again showed a disposition to revolt; and when the duke came, he counselled the postponement of the enterprise till next year; and the lords and knights returned home, chagrined at making such a bold display to no purpose. After their disbandment, the mighty fleet was scattered by a tempest, and many of the ships were captured by the English.

A contest was now approaching between the king and his parliament, which seemed to threaten a political revolution. His personal expenses were enormous. It is related that his household consisted of ten thousand persons; that there were three hundred in his kitchen, and that all his offices were crowded in like proportion. He was encouraged in his extravagance by his private counsellors, and it is no wonder that the commons, feeling the supplies which they had

granted chiefly for upholding the honour of the country in its wars with France were spent in folly and favouritism, were disaffected. In a parliament held this year, the commons petitioned the king that the state of his household might be overlooked by the chancellor, treasurer, and clerk of the privy seal, and that they should be empowered to amend what they found amiss at their discretion. This was refused, and the commons, under the guidance of the king's uncle, the duke of Gloucester, determined to drive his favourites, De la Pole and De Vere, from office. They commenced with De la Pole, who was impeached, and was sentenced to pay a heavy fine, and to be imprisoned. In order to avoid parting with his favourite, Richard had retired to Eltham with his whole court,



ELTHAM PALACE.

but on being threatened with the fate of Edward II., he returned, and made the bishop of Ely chancellor, in the room of De la Pole. Other changes were made to please the commons, but still they were not satisfied. There would be no good government, they said, until a permanent council was chosen by parliament to reform the state of the nation. They demanded a commission of regency for one year, a commission with very large powers, the most formidable of which was that those who advised a revocation of their authority should be deemed guilty of treason. Richard demurred at granting such a commission; rather than consent, he said, he would dissolve parliament. But opposition was useless. The commons produced the statute by which Edward II. had been deposed, and the demand was conceded.

Hume says, that by the appointment of this commission of regency the king was dethroned, and the aristocracy rendered supreme. It was not an actual dethronement, but it is certain that Richard was shorn of all power. The commission consisted of eleven peers and prelates, to whom were added the three great officers of the crown. At their head was the duke of Gloucester, and from that time Richard hated him with a mortal hatred. He was the more embittered because he found that from the moment he had signed the commission he was in reality only king in name. His person was neglected, and his court deserted. All applications for place and power were made to the commission of regency. To a prince so fond of pomp and state as Richard was, such a position was intensely galling. He was now twenty years of age, and yet he was as complete a cipher in the state as when, nine years before, he commenced his reign. Thus degraded, acting under the advice of De la Pole, who had escaped from his prison at Windsor, Tresilian, chief justice of the King's Bench, De Vere, duke of Ireland, Sir Nicholas Brember, lord mayor of London, and the archbishop of York—who was one of the commission of regency, but hostile to the duke of Gloucester and the other members—the judges were assembled at Nottingham to decide the question as to whether the commission of government appointed by parliament, and approved of by the king's own seal, was legal or illegal. The judges certified that it was illegal, and that those who interfered with his rights in procuring it to be passed, or enforcing his consent thereto, were traitors. These opinions were given under an obligation of secrecy, and Richard concerted measures for the arrest and indictment of those who had thus been judicially pronounced guilty of treason. But the secret was not long kept, and the duke of Gloucester, aware of the gathering storm, prepared to meet it. The opinion of the judges was given in August, A.D. 1387. In November, Richard entered London, and was received with acclamations. Sir Nicholas Brember had influenced the citizens in his favour, and he was conducted to his palace in triumph. But this triumph was short-lived. On the next day it was known that the duke of Gloucester, at the head of forty thousand men, was approaching the capital. Associated with him in the command were the earls of Arundel and Nottingham, the constable, admiral, and mareschal of England. On their march they were joined by the earls of Warwick and Derby. As they approached the city, a letter was sent to Sir Nicholas Brember, commanding him to make proclamation that their design in taking up arms was to bring him and the other four counsellors of the king, who had met at Nottingham, to justice. The duke entered London on the 17th of November, with an irresistible force, and a formal appeal, or accusation of high treason against the obnoxious counsellors, was forthwith made before the king at Westminster. With his accustomed dissimulation, Richard promised that the accused should be brought to trial before the next parliament, which was to meet in February, A.D. 1388. In the meantime De Vere, duke of Ireland, by authority of royal letters, raised an army in the north for the purposes of civil war. He was, however, met on the banks of the Isis, near Radcot, by the duke of Gloucester and Henry of Bolingbroke, where he was completely defeated. De la Pole fled to France, De Vere to Ireland, and the archbishop of York to Flanders. Tresilian and Brember found refuge for a time in concealment. Richard himself retired into the Tower, and his uncle Gloucester, who had every reason to believe that his courtiers intended to arrest him secretly and put him to death, drove every one of them from his court, and threw several of them into prison. There was not a single person left about King Richard for whom he had the least affection, or in whom he could place the slightest confidence.

All these proceedings were sanctioned by the "wonderful parliament," which met at Westminster on the day appointed. In that parliament the five obnoxious counsellors were impeached on a charge of high treason, and were found guilty with an unanimity which showed how bitterly they were hated. They were to be executed, and their estates confiscated. As before seen, Richard had promised that they should appear before parliament to answer for themselves, but three of them had fled from the country, and the other two lay concealed in or about London. These latter, however — Tresilian, the chief justice, and Brember, the mayor — were now hunted out, discovered, arrested, and executed. But the vengeance of this "wonderful parliament" was not yet satisfied. The judges who had signed and sealed the answer at Nottingham were impeached and condemned, but on the intercession of the prelates their lives were spared. Their estates were confiscated, and they were exiled to different towns in Ireland for the natural term of their lives. John Blake, however, who had drawn up the questions at Nottingham, and Thomas Usk, who had been appointed secretly under-sheriff, to seize the person of Gloucester, although they both pleaded that they acted by the king's command, were condemned and executed. There was then a pause in the shedding of blood, but after Easter four knights were impeached, convicted, and executed, among whom was Sir Simon Burley, the friend of Edward III. and the Black Prince, and who had acted as guardian to Richard. Both the king and Queen Anne earnestly begged that *his* life might be spared, but Gloucester spurned their entreaties; the king's crown, he said, depended on his immediate execution, and he was sent to the block on Tower Hill. But while this "wonderful parliament" was Gloucester's willing instrument in carrying out his vengeance on those who favoured the king, it expressed its loyalty towards the king's person, for it was declared that nothing contained in the articles reflected any dishonour on him, on "account of his youth and innocency!" Parliament, also, sought to prove its loyalty to Richard by grants of money; but "all was false and hollow."

The power of government was now wholly in the hands of the duke of Gloucester and of the council or commission. For about twelve months Richard submitted to their sway; secretly, however, resolving to throw off the yoke at the first favourable opportunity. Meanwhile, there was war in the north between the English and the Scots. During the spring of this year the Scots had made several incursions into England; and in the summer they besieged Newcastle. Lord Henry Percy had been appointed by the Commission of Regency to keep the frontier of Northumberland against them; but the Scotch lords and knights, seeing that the English "were not all of one accord," gathered together at Aberdeen, and concerted a plan for meeting near the border. A large army crossed the Tyne and went on to Durham, from whence they retreated, and laid siege to Newcastle. They were encountered here by the younger Percys; their father, the earl of Northumberland, keeping the pass of Alnwick. The fight which ensued appears more like a tournament than a real battle; it was between the leaders on both sides. There was a hand-to-hand fight between the earl of Douglas and lord Henry Percy. Douglas won Percy's pennon, and said that "he would set it on high on his castle of Dalkeith;" and Percy swore that he should not carry it out of England, and then they parted. The next day the Scots retreated to Otterbourne, whither Percy followed them to win back his pennon. It was here that the battle, famous in song under the name of Chevy Chase, was fought; a song, or ballad, which treats the conflict, historically true, as a border feud. It was fought on the 10th of August. It was a fearful battle. On the one side, Douglas was slain; on the other, Lord Henry Percy, known in history by the name of Hotspur, and his brother, Lord Ralph Percy, were taken prisoners. In the end the Scots were the victors. But fierce as the conflict was, according to Froissart, the English and the Scots were courteous towards each other when it was over. "Englishmen," he says, "on the one part, and the Scots on the other part, are good men of war. When they meet there is hard fighting without sparring. There is no love between them as long as spears, swords, axes, or daggers will endure; but they lay on each upon the other, and when they be well beaten, and that the one part hath obtained the victory, then they glorify so in their deeds of arms, and are so joyful, that such as be taken they shall be ransomed ere they go out of the field; so that shortly each of them is so content with the other, that, at their departing courteously, they will say,—'God thank you!'" If not *on* the field, Hotspur was soon after ransomed: the great Douglas was buried at Melrose.

The favourable opportunity for which Richard watched to throw off the yoke of his uncle Gloucester's sway came in the year 1389. History is silent as to the causes which led to his self-emancipation; but certain it is that he succeeded. At a great council, held in May, he suddenly asked the duke of Gloucester: "How old am I?" His uncle replied, "Your highness is in your twenty-second year." "Then," rejoined Richard, "I am surely of age to manage my own affairs. I have been longer under control than any ward in my dominions. I thank ye, my lords, for your past services, but I shall want them no longer." There was no resistance; the great seal was forthwith taken from Arundel, archbishop of York, and given to William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, and the duke of Gloucester, the earls of Warwick and Arundel, and all who had been brought into office by them, were dismissed. It was a bold stroke for the resumption of his power, but Richard was completely triumphant. His measures to secure it were also equally successful. He issued a proclamation informing the people that he had now taken the reins of government into his own hands, from which they might expect greater tranquillity than they had hitherto enjoyed; and soon after he issued a general pardon, and remitted a portion of the grants which had been made by the "wonderful parliament." His chancellor, the bishop of Winchester, also, in a parliament held at Westminster in January, A.D. 1390, declared the king to be of full age, and that he intended to govern his people in peace and quiet; to do justice to all men; and that both clergy and laity should enjoy all their liberties.

But although a season of tranquillity *did* ensue, it was not from Richard's attention to the administration of government, the chief affairs of which were left in the hands of his uncle, the duke of York, and of his designing cousin, Henry of Bolingbroke.

The struggle of parties seemed now to be at an end. John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, having completed the matrimonial alliances of his daughters, returned from the Continent, and became reconciled with the king, and, by a singular coincidence, popular with the people. By his influence, the duke of Gloucester and the nobles of his party were brought back to court, and were warmly welcomed. King Richard brought his old art of dissimulation into full play on this occasion. He embraced his "dear uncle" Gloucester with the utmost seeming affection: no one, in truth, who witnessed the affecting scene, could have doubted the sincerity of his reconciliation. Gloucester was readmitted into the council, and yet all the while Richard was contemplating his ruin. He was most lavish in his favours to his relatives. The duke of Lancaster, who had failed to obtain his "two crowns," had an additional dukedom given him. He was created duke of Aquitaine for life, with a grant of all the revenues of that duchy. His cousin Edward, eldest son of the duke of York, also came in for a share of his bounty. He was created earl of Rutland, with a suitable annuity to support his dignity. To all this the parliament, which met in January, consented, for there was a wonderful unanimity between the king and his lords and commons at this period. As for his personal treasury, that was amply replenished. The commons poured into it one-third of forty shillings on every sack of wool exported, and of five marks on every last of leather, the remaining two-thirds being reserved as a fund in case of war. But no money was needed for war at present, for Lancaster, commissioned by parliament, concluded a truce with France, which, being renewed in the spring of A.D. 1393, lasted during the present reign, Scotland being included in the pacification. There was peace, therefore, at home and abroad for some time, except that in the year 1392 there were tumults in London, in one of which the populace assaulted the palace of the lord high treasurer. For this offence the mayor and the sheriffs were imprisoned, and the city deprived of its liberties. The citizens, however, having submitted to the king's pleasure, and implored his mercy, he went to London; and the "good queen Anne" having united her prayers with theirs, Richard set the mayor and the sheriffs free, and restored and confirmed their charters. The citizens thought there never was such a godlike king as Richard was at this period, for in his anger he remembered mercy. Every parliament, also, that met during this golden age of tranquillity, granted him all he wanted, and more than once returned their humble thanks for his good government, while he, on his part, thanked them for their loyalty and liberality.

Ireland also tasted of King Richard's royal favours. On Whit-Sunday, A.D. 1394, the "good queen Anne" died at Shene. Some historians say that it was in order to divert his grief for her loss that he undertook an expedition into Ireland. It does not appear, however, that he was a loving husband, and it is clear he was not worthy of such an excellent wife. His object in going to Ireland appears rather to have been to quell a revolt of the native chiefs, and suppress the discontent of the colonists. He took with him a large army, four thousand knights, and thirty thousand archers, the mere demonstration of which force prevented any battle. Four of the principal chiefs, or kings as they were called, came to Dublin, and submitted themselves to him without delay. Richard was never more in his element than when he was in Ireland. He gave sumptuous entertainments, and displayed so much regal magnificence, that the Irish people fell into a maze of wonder. It was too dazzling, at first, for the Irish kings to mingle with in comfort. Richard wished that they would conform in manners and apparel to the usages of England; that they should eat at his table, and wear the gowns of silk furred with minever, and the linen breeches he had ordered to be provided for them. But for some time they could not be brought to such a state of English refinement. They *would* sit at the same table as the minstrels and servants, eating out of the same dish, and drinking out of the same cup. They truly were prodigies, for they were *humble* kings. At length, however, they sate with Richard at his banquets, and were properly attired; and then he carried out a purpose he had all along entertained—he created them knights with all the solemnities of holy church. Then, having spent the winter in Dublin, in the spring of the year 1395 he returned to England.

In that year Richard resolved upon taking a step which broke the charm of his popularity. A magnificent embassy was sent to Paris to demand the Princess Isabella, eldest daughter of Charles VI., in marriage. Isabella was only eight years of age, and the marshal of England knelt before her, and told her that by the grace of God she should be "our lady and queen of England." "If it please God, and my lord my father," replied the precocious child, "that I shall be queen of England, I shall be glad, for it has been shown me that I shall then be a great lady." The articles of the intended marriage were soon settled with Charles VI., and the count of St. Pol came to England to make definite arrangements with King Richard. It was of little consequence that the king and the young French princess were within the degrees of consanguinity; that obstacle was removed by a dispensation from the Pope. It was in the autumn of the year 1396, that Richard went to the Continent to claim his child-bride. He went with a magnificent retinue of nobles and knights; and Charles VI. left Paris with a retinue of equal gorgeousness to meet him. They met between Calais and Arras, where they embraced, and drank wine out of jewelled cups. In a few days the child-queen arrived, with a cavalcade of golden chariots, and silken litters, and ladies wearing garlands of pearls and diamonds. She was introduced to Richard by her uncles, and received by the duchesses of Lancaster and Gloucester; and he having promised to cherish her as his wife, the two courts repaired to Calais, where, at the church of St. Nicholas, on the 4th of November, the marriage was celebrated.

ular union was accompanied by a ratifica- truce between England and France for years, and so far it was a happy event. fatal to the internal concord of the king- orked ruin to the royal bridegroom. It edly unpopular match, and Richard knew led his bride to the altar of St. Nicholas. count of St. Pol was making the final ts with him, he intimated that his uncle was opposed to the union, and that if he people to rebellion his crown would be ie count replied that he must dissimulate, ucester by fair words and great gifts till as made and his bride was in England, he wanted aid against his rebel subjects, suredly be given by the king of France. nted no lesson in the art of dissimulation, already a perfect master in that depart- igcraft. He knew well how to fawn and friendship which he did not feel; and he l that his heart had long meditated re- e hideous mask of false friendship which ntly worn, now that he was in alliance e, was soon thrown off; and the blow he y contemplated, struck. Gloucester was as prudent in his observations about the l and friendly alliance which Richard had l France. "Our Edward," he said, "had or into the heart of Paris; but under e alliance of the French was courted, and l trembled at their presence even in Lon- e was bold speaking, and the people n to be the champion of the national ut it sealed his fate. One day after the wick had been entertained by Richard at that nobleman was arrested; then the ndel was invited to a friendly conference ing, and *he* was seized likewise. But the was still to be struck; and it was effected nate cunning and rash boldness. Accord- ssart, Richard set out from London as if g to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. He rering Bower, in Essex, and from thence to tle, where the duke of Gloucester was ith his family. He arrived at Pleshy o'clock in the afternoon, and when the of his approach, he and the duchess and n repaired to the castle court to greet him come. There were friendly greetings, and paired to a chamber where supper was laid eshment. But he did not sit long, and on asked his "fair uncle" to have five or six led, and ride with him to London, for that his counsel at a meeting that was to take e morrow with the Londoners. Gloucester ie trap. Richard rode on at a great pace, he came to a place where he had placed rshal in ambush, the duke was arrested in name, and hurried to a barge in the id then into a ship, and the next night he lodged in the castle of Calais.

l the rolls of parliament simply state that f Gloucester was arrested at Pleshy when rth in procession humbly to meet the king, reason to doubt this circumstantial relation of the event by Froissart, for it is in perfect keeping with the boldness and cunning which belonged to Richard's character. The arrest of the duke caused great agitation in the country. Those who were bound to Gloucester by the ties of the nearest relationship, and those who had taken part in the proceedings of A.D. 1387, were struck with terror lest his revenge should fall upon them likewise. Hence, when he called upon his uncles Lancaster and York, and his cousin Henry, and other noblemen, to put their seals to a parchment by which Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick were "appealed" of treason, in the same manner that they had before "appealed" his favourites, they too readily complied. Richard now only wanted an obsequious parliament to carry out his measures of revenge, and by the influence of his sheriffs, the elections were so managed that he obtained a parliament ready to obey his will. It was summoned to meet on the 17th of September, A.D. 1397, to try the "three traitors," for so they were called, even by the very men who had acted with them, and supported them in all their boldest measures. How they became so craven-hearted and submissive is a mystery, unless the solution may be found in the terror that Richard's masterly craft was well calculated to inspire, and that he "kept in his wages ten thousand archers." His subservient parliament is said to have been surrounded by his troops, and it is certain that he went to meet it with six hundred men-at-arms, and a strong body of stout bowmen. The commons made short work of what they were called upon to do. Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, was impeached of high treason and banished for life; his brother, the earl of Arundel, was condemned and executed; and the earl of Warwick was sentenced to die, but his life was spared. On the 21st of September, a writ was issued to the earl-marshal to bring the duke of Gloucester to the bar of the house, and on the 24th, a letter was read from him in reply, that he could not produce his prisoner; "for that he being in custody in the king's prison at Calais, had died there." Three days were scarcely sufficient for a king's messenger to travel to Calais and back at that period, and it might naturally have been supposed that the letter, if genuine, had been pre-written; but no inquiry was made about it or the duke's death, and no surprise was expressed. No one seemed to care about the manner of his death, and no account was given, but it scarcely admits of a doubt that he was privately murdered by the order of his nephew, the king. So subservient were the lords appellant, and the commons, to Richard's will and pleasure, that the dead duke was declared a traitor, and all his estates and honours forfeited. Richard was so well pleased with their subservience, that, although several of those who passed these sentences had been equally guilty in opposing his power, and appealing his favourites of treason, he made a declaration, in full parliament, of their innocence in regard to all past transactions. He even promoted some of them to honour. His cousin, Henry of Bolingbroke, was created duke of Hereford; the earl of Nottingham, duke of Norfolk; and John Holland, the king's half-brother, who had committed the foul murder at York, was made duke of Exeter. The earls of Rut-

land and Huntingdon were created dukes of Albemarle and Surrey; the earl of Somerset, marquis of Dorset; and the lords Despencer, Neville, Percy, and Scrope, earls of Gloucester, Westmoreland, Worcester, and Wiltshire. In the next parliament, which met at Shrewsbury in January, A.D. 1398, the same sub-

COUNCIL HOUSE, SHREWSBURY.

mission to the royal pleasure was displayed. It reversed all the acts of the "wonderful parliament," in which the duke of Gloucester's party had predominated; and its members, the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons took an oath on the cross of Canterbury never to suffer any of the transactions to be changed to which *they* had consented. To make them the more binding, a bull was obtained from the Pope confirming all the acts of this parliament, which was read in all the chief cities of the kingdom.

King Richard was now supreme. The "subservient parliament" had granted him taxes for the natural term of his life. He wanted no subsidies, and he might spend his money how he pleased; for it was treason of any person even to suggest the necessity of control. He was a monarch of unlimited power. Ten thousand archers surrounded him night and day, and "there was none so great in England that durst speak against anything that he did, or would do." But although the people dared not speak aloud, there were still some who ventured to pour confidential whispers into each other's ears adverse to his absolutism. Among these were the newly-created dukes of Hereford and Norfolk, the only two of the lords appellant remaining who had given such deep offence in the eleventh year of his reign. Although, to all appearances, they enjoyed Richard's favour and confidence, their knowledge of his character convinced them that their sin had never been forgiven; and one day as they were riding between London and Brentford, they held commune with each other in whispered inuendoes concerning their mutual danger. Norfolk, it appears, who was the most communicative of the two, and the most suspicious of the king's treachery, commenced the conversation by declaring that they were on the point of being ruined. "For what?" asked Hereford. "For the affair of Radcot Bridge," was the reply. "That can never be," said Hereford, "after his pardon and declaration in parliament." "Nevertheless," rejoined Norfolk, "our fate · like that of others before us. It is a marvell treacherous world we live in!" Hereford s peared unwilling to believe his brother of N although he asserted there was a certain plot king's council to undo six lords, they being am doomed. This conversation was divulged to R and Hereford has been suspected of the treache is probable that he related it in order to as whether there was any foundation in Norfolk' about the plot in progress for their ruin. Be it may, Hereford was called upon to declare bef parliament at Shrewsbury what had passed b them as they journeyed between London and ford, and when he had told the story, procla was made for Norfolk, who was not present, to before the king. He surrendered, and the two knelt before Richard; and Norfolk having Hereford a liar and traitor, both were order custody.

It was on the last day of the session at Shre that this scene occurred, and the two houses h viously chosen a committee of twelve lords a commoners, to sit after the dissolution, wi powers to examine and determine certain matt undone by parliament, as they should see fit quarrel between Norfolk and Hereford was one matters on which they had to adjudicate. ingly, as it was an affair of honour, the ei commissioners sat at a court of chivalry at W The accused and accuser were brought before and as the one still denied the accusation, and down the gauntlet to prove his innocence by w battle, and the other still affirmed that his sta was true, it was decided that they should en lists at Coventry, on the 26th of September. the day came, the king, surrounded by his nobl guarded by thousands of men in harness, as stage. The combatants appeared. Henry of H entered the list making the sign of the cross forehead; Norfolk entered crying, "God ai that hath the right." Their lances were a but there was no fighting. The king a eighteen commissioners had already decided t of the combatants. Richard cast down his and the heralds shouted aloud that Hereford Norfolk would not fight that day. Then th pronounced his predetermined sentence. H was to be banished the kingdom for ten yea Norfolk for life. Hereford went to France, an folk made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and final of a broken heart at Venice.

From this time Richard set no limits to h potism. He conceived that all who could oppo were put out of his way, and therefore did w listed. He had declared an amnesty for all o but he now extorted fines from seventeen co alleging that they had been implicated in the at Radcot Bridge; he raised money by forced and interrupted the course of justice by coerci judges. There were robbers everywhere in th and highways. Merchants were despoiled, and vators plundered of their produce. The peopl plained that all they had was taken from the yet they dared not speak; that they had a kin

or nothing but his pleasure and the gratification own will. One of his most flagrant acts of ce was the seizing of the property of the power- se of Lancaster. He had granted letters patent le Hereford to claim livery of his inheritance his father die during his banishment; and yet John of Gaunt, three months after his son was d, breathed his last, he decreed that he was le of succeeding by attorney to his father's and appropriated them to his own use. But e acts of tyranny were surely working his own There was wide-spread disaffection among both and people. He held a tournament at Windsor, spring of A.D. 1399, where he and his child- at in more than wonted splendour, but few the feast, whether lords or knights or common rs. This was ominous. He was told that d conspiracies were forming against him, and this very moment he chose to leave England. rl of March, heir presumptive to the throne, n surprised and slain by a party of natives in , and he resolved to go to that country to his death. So, after appointing the duke of gent, hearing mass at St. George's Chapel, and his child-queen a parting kiss at the door, he l to Milford Haven and set sail for Ireland, his ions consisting more of courtiers and parasites od soldiers.

MILFORD HAVEN.

Londoners were true prophets. When Richard l for Ireland, they said he would never again with joy; and they were right. He took the ainst the Irish on the 20th of June, and a t after, Henry, now duke of Lancaster, landed nspur, in Yorkshire. He brought no army im, for it was with difficulty that he had from France. His retinue consisted only of d archbishop of Canterbury, the brother of the l Arundel, fifteen knights and men-at-arms and a few domestics. But Lancaster wanted no foreign army to aid him in his cause. When he rode out of London to his exile, thousands followed him on the road, weeping, and when he landed at Ravenspur on his return, he was received with shouts of welcome. He was the more welcome as Richard's tyranny had become bitter to the nation. Among the first who joined him were the great earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland. Concealing his real design, Hereford gave out that he only came to claim his right, to recover his hereditary possessions. Thousands flocked to support him in that claim, and he marched boldly towards the capital. He arrived there at the head of sixty thousand men, and as the duke of York had no confidence in the Londoners, he quitted the city, and raised the royal standard at St. Albans. So joyful were the Londoners at Henry's appearing among them, that they had a general holiday; there was no more work done, says Froissart, "than an it had been Easter-day." London supplied him with many willing supporters, and thus strengthened, he marched into the west. The duke of York moved westward also, but there was no fighting between him and his nephew. Both reached the Severn on the same day, and then there was an interview which ended in the regent espousing the cause of Lancaster. Some of the creatures of Richard had fled to Bristol, and shut themselves up in the castle. It was captured by their united forces, and three members of the standing committee, who had aided Richard in his acts of tyranny—the earl of Wiltshire, Sir John Bussy, and Sir Henry Green—found in the castle, were executed without a trial, "to the great joy of the people." Henry of Lancaster then marched on to Chester, leaving his uncle York at Bristol.

Richard, meanwhile, had been leading his army into the bogs and thickets of Ireland to no purpose. As he advanced, the chiefs retreated. They drew him on till his provisions failed, and the murmurs of his troops compelled him to retrace his steps. The Irish chief, MacMore, was his great opponent, and Richard swore by St. Edward that he would not leave Ireland till he had him in his power, alive or dead. But he reached Dublin without accomplishing anything, except setting everything on fire in his route. Richard spent six weeks at Dublin. No news had arrived from England, for the winds had been contrary; but at length messengers arrived with evil tidings. The exiled Lancaster was in England; the people were in arms, and towns and castles had been yielded to the invader. "This man," exclaimed Richard, "designs to deprive me of my country." A council was held, and Salisbury was sent into Wales, where he collected a considerable force; but when Richard himself, about twenty days after, landed at Milford Haven, the revolution was nearly accom-

plished. Both the English and Welsh had deserted the earl of Salisbury to a man, and Richard had no forces to fight for him but those he had brought with him; and *they, too*, on the second day after his landing, with but few exceptions, abandoned him to his fate.

Helpless and hopeless, the king, who had ruled with such absolute sway, became a wanderer. Disguised as a priest, and accompanied only by his two half-brothers, Exeter and Surrey, his chancellor, Scroop, the bishop of Carlisle, and nine other individuals, he went from castle to castle, until at length he found a resting-place at Conway. Henry was still at Chester, and Exeter and Surrey were despatched thither to ascertain what were his intentions. No answer was given: having disclosed where the king was to be found, they were placed under arrest. Percy, earl of Northumberland, undertook to secure the king; and, according to the common story, this was effected by Richard's own fatal weapon, treachery. Percy marched from Chester with men-at-arms and archers, took possession of the castles of Flint and Rhuddlan as he advanced; and, approaching Conway, he concealed his forces behind a rock, and rode forward with a few attendants to the castle. Being admitted, he proposed certain conditions to the king, to which, as they did not affect his royal authority, he readily consented. Richard was to be secured on his throne, and his cousin Henry, on asking his pardon on his bended knees, was to be restored to the estates and honours of his family. The king and Henry were to meet at Flint to ratify the conditions; to the observance of which Percy pledged his honour and his faith. This is the commonly received story of Richard's capture; and as he, the king, had for years dissimulated in order to entrap his victims, it is likely that Percy adopted the same crooked policy to entrap him. At the same time, other authorities relate that famine drove him away from Conway Castle, and that he surrendered from sheer despair to Northumberland. Whichever story is correct, in the evening the prisoner and his escort reached Flint; and when, on the next morning, he saw from the tower of the castle the approach of Henry of Bolingbroke and his mighty host, "he shuddered and wept." Their meeting is thus recorded by a French knight who was present:—"Then"—when Lancaster entered the castle—"they made the king, who had dined in the donjon, come down to meet Duke Henry, who, as soon as he perceived him at a distance, bowed very low to the ground, and as they approached each other, he bowed a second time, with his cap in his hand; and then the king took off his bonnet, and spake first, in this manner, 'Fair cousin of Lancaster, you are right welcome.' Then Duke Henry replied, bowing very low to the ground, 'My lord, I am come sooner than you sent for me, the reason whereof I will tell you. The common report of your people is such, that you have, for the space of twenty or two-and-twenty years, governed them very badly and very rigorously, and insomuch that they are not well contented therewith. But if it please our lord, I will help you to govern them better than they have been governed in time past.' King Richard then answered him, 'Fair cousin, since it pleaseth you, it pleaseth us well.'" This French knight vouches for the exact words which passed on this memorable occasion, "for," says he, "I heard and understood them very well."

Lancaster conducted the captive king to his head-quarters at Chester. Froissart represents him as mounted on a miserable hackney on his journey, and as being unpitied by all who saw him in that low condition. His very dog, he says, left his side to fawn upon his destroyer. At Chester writs were issued in Richard's name to summon a parliament on the 30th of September. Lancaster and the king then rode on to London. It is evident that Richard felt he was in the hands of one who designed his dethronement, for at Lichfield he endeavoured to make his escape. But this attempt failed, and he was afterwards guarded with greater vigilance. As they approached London, they were met by the mayor and the principal citizens; and as the cavalcade moved slowly onwards through the streets of the city, the people shouted, "Long live the duke of Lancaster!" and poured forth bitter imprecations on the head of King Richard. The captive was lodged in the Tower. Walsingham says that the recorder of London entreated Lancaster in the name of the city, and for the public safety, to put him to death, with all his adherents who were prisoners. But "the pear was not ripe." Lancaster prudently resolved to make many others participate in his guilt before he proceeded to such an extremity. That he now, however, resolved to obtain his crown, became manifest. It is related that in an interview between the king and Lancaster, Richard declared in a rage that he was still king, and that he would retain his dignity in spite of all his enemies. If so, his resolution was soon shaken. On the 29th of September a deputation of nobles and prelates, and of knights and justices, waited on him with an instrument already prepared, and by which, when he had attached his signature to it, he resigned his crown, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance. It is asserted that he signed it with a cheerful countenance, and that he gave his royal ring to his cousin Henry, and said that if he had the power, he should name him as his successor. So reads a parliamentary record, and the chronicle of Froissart, but his cheerful surrender of his crown and sceptre may be doubted. There appears, indeed, to be no doubt that the surrender was made under compulsion, for a few years afterwards Henry was denounced by the earl of Northumberland, who was present, as having compelled Richard's abdication under threats of death. But however it was made, whether willingly or by compulsion, it was sufficient for Lancaster's purpose. Parliament met on the 30th of September, at Westminster Hall. The Hall was crowded, only one seat was empty—the throne. Lancaster sat in his place as a peer. Richard's resignation was read, and the members standing up signified their acceptance of it; while shouts of joy from the people outside the hall told that *they, too*, were "content." But simple abdication was not deemed sufficient for his dethronement. He was impeached. The Act of Deposition, which was read, consisted of thirty-three articles, embracing the leading features of his tyranny, such as the murder of the duke of Gloucester, the convictions of Warwick, Arundel, and others, the banishment of Henry, and

the seizure of his estates, his unfaithfulness and inconstancy, his despotic tendencies, and his disregard of the laws of his country. It was particularly objected to him that he was wont to say that the laws were "in his mouth," and "in his breast," and that he alone could change them; that he maintained the life and property of his subjects were at his will and pleasure, without any forfeiture. This act of solemn deposition was pronounced by eight commissioners. One only in that assembly dissented from its articles. Hayward, in his life of Henry IV., says that Thomas Merks, bishop of Carlisle, boldly defended the king, imputing the errors into which he had fallen, rather to his want of experience, or to evil counsel, than to malice. The bishop, however, had no sooner ceased speaking, than Lancaster ordered him to be arrested and sent prisoner to the abbey of St. Albans, a deed more unconstitutional and arbitrary than Richard himself, despotic as he was, had ever committed.

And now came the crowning act of this wonderful revolution. Rising from his seat, approaching the throne, and solemnly crossing himself, Henry exclaimed, "In the name of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I, Henry of Lancaster, challenge this realm of England, and the crown, with all the members and the appurtenances, because I am descended by right line of blood from the good lord King Henry III., and through that right, that God of his grace hath sent me with help of my kin and my friends, to recover it; the which realm was in point to be undone for default of government and undoing of the good laws." Rounds of applause followed this ambiguous speech, and amid the vociferations of all present that his claim was just, the archbishops of Canterbury and York led him up the steps of the throne, where Henry of Lancaster took his seat as king of England. When silence was restored, the primate preached a sermon from the words of the prophet Samuel, when he anointed Saul king over Israel: "Behold the man whom I spake to thee of: this same shall reign over my people."

Richard did not long survive his deposition. On being told the day after that his cousin Henry reigned in his stead, he expressed a hope that he would be "good lord to him;" but he hoped in vain. His liberty, whether at home or abroad, would have been fatal to the quiet rule of the House of Lancaster, and he was adjudged to perpetual imprisonment, in safe and secret ward. Froissart says, that no one expected that he would ever come out of his prison alive; and so it happened. The manner of his death, and the exact time at which it took place, are not known with certainty; but the most probable account is that he was starved to death in the castle of Pontefract, in Yorkshire, about the beginning of the year 1400, a time at which, as will be seen in a future page, there was a reaction in his favour. Richard II. was one of the most ignoble kings that ever swayed the English sceptre. His person and character are thus described by a contemporary writer:—"A fair, round, and feminine face, sometimes flushed; abrupt and stammering in his speech; capricious in his manners; extravagantly splendid in his entertainments; irascible and proud; devoted to luxury, remaining sometimes till midnight, and sometimes till morning in drinking, and in other excesses not to be named; grievously extorting taxes from his people every year of his reign, and wasting on his vices the money obtained under the pretext of repelling the national enemy." Hideous as this picture is, it does not appear to be greatly overdrawn; but it must be conceded, that those by whom he was surrounded during the various phases of his life and reign, were in some measure responsible to the nation for his evil doings and misrule. His uncles and guardians not only neglected his education, but, for a series of years, encouraged him to spend his time with the dissolute of both sexes, that they might have the management of the affairs of the country; and when, at length, he took the reins of government in his own hands, his favourites and counsellors were too ready to aid him in the tyranny which his want of education and dissolute habits had engendered. Had he been better trained in his youth he might have been a wiser king.

The history of Scotland is so intermingled with that of England at this period, that to dwell on it at length would be only repetition. When Richard ascended his throne, Robert Stuart occupied that of Scotland. From age and infirmities, by the consent of his parliament, which assembled at Edinburgh A.D. 1389, Robert constituted his second son, Robert, earl of Fife, governor of the kingdom. Young Robert made an incursion into England, and plundered some part of the open country; but his father, who was of a mild and pacific spirit, about the same time concluded a truce with England, which, for some time, gave a mutual check to the depredations of the borderers. King Robert died A.D. 1390, and was succeeded by his eldest son, John; but who, by the advice of his parliament, assumed the name of Robert III. Before his coronation, this monarch took a solemn oath to observe the truce with England, and that truce being afterwards prolonged, there was peace between the two kingdoms till the deposition of King Richard, after which, as will be seen, hostilities were renewed. But though Scotland was by the truce secured from foreign enemies, its internal tranquillity was frequently disturbed by deadly feuds between clans and families. One of these feuds between two of the highland clans was so fierce in its character, that it was feared both of them would be utterly extirpated. It was finally, however, determined by a solemn judicial combat. This combat took place in a plain on the banks of the river Tay, near Perth, A.D. 1396; the king and his court, with a vast concourse of people, witnessing the spectacle. Thirty on each side, without any defensive armour, fought with swords, and with such relentless fury, that on the one side nineteen were slain and eleven wounded, and on the other, twenty-nine were killed and one escaped unhurt. It may be mentioned, that in a parliament held at Scone, A.D. 1398, King Robert created his eldest son David duke of Rothsay, and his brother Robert duke of Albany, which were the two first dukedoms in Scotland.

CHAPTER II.

History of Laws and Government, from the Accession of Henry III., A.D. 1216, to the Deposition of Richard II., A.D. 1399.

SECTION I.

THE Great Charter granted by King John towards the end of the former period, contains a distinct and authentic plan of the English constitution as it then existed. But that constitution was not fully established. The people esteemed it the great security of their most valuable rights and privileges; but the ruling powers deemed it an innovation on theirs. It struck at the very root of kingly despotism, and hence the kings of the present period were backward in executing its most important articles. But it was an age when men not only sought, but were determined to have their rights. It was an age when the nation possessed some acknowledged power over not only the will of the monarch, but the public purse. It was an age when, if the king asked an "aid," the nation demanded some equivalent in return; when at every new extortion there was a corresponding weakening of the power to extort. Thus the history of the reign of Henry III., the successor of King John, is one continuous record of money obtained by redress of grievances. It was in vain that he attempted to set up his prerogative above the charters; he was compelled to yield to the will of the nation, to rule according to the law. During his reign the Great Charter was confirmed with some variations no less than seven times, some of which confirmations were attended with very great solemnities. In the second year of his reign, A.D. 1217, the articles respecting the royal forests were left out of the Great Charter, and were formed into a separate charter, called *Charta de Foresta*, or the "Charter of the Forest." These charters formed the basis of all English laws, and the kings of England were henceforth expected to rule by those laws. "The king," said a judge of this period, "must not be subject to any man, but to God and the law, for the law makes him king. Let the king, therefore, give to the law what the law gives to him, dominion and power; for there is no king where will, and not law, bears rule." It is from this date, therefore, that the rule of law commences, although ages elapsed before that rule became perfect. The tree of liberty was planted, and was taking root; but it was during this and successive reigns that it spread forth branches which finally overshadowed the land.

During the reign of Henry III. some changes were made in the ranks and orders of men in society. From this change, however, the serfs, or slaves, were excepted; they remained in the same wretched state of servitude as heretofore. Bracton, a celebrated lawyer who flourished in this reign, states, that all the goods acquired by a slave, of right belonged to his lord, who might take them from him whenever he pleased. Slaves, indeed, were in this, and in the succeeding reign, still an article of commerce. Thus, in the Annals of Dunstable, it is related that in the year 1283, William Pyke and his family were sold for one mark. The next rank in society consisted of farmers, mechanics, and traders, who were freemen, but were either not proprietors of land, or of only small quantities; while immediately above them were the yeomanry and burgesses of the great towns. But the greatest change in society occurred in the upper classes. It was in the reign of the third Henry that the distinction between the nobility and gentry became conspicuous. Hitherto, all who held of the crown *in capite*, were esteemed noble, and formed one order; but the great inequality of the power and wealth among its members, laid the foundation of a division of them into the greater and smaller barons. This division was manifested by the manner in which they were summoned to parliament, for while the greater barons had a particular summons directed to them, the lesser barons had a general summons addressed to each county in which they resided. It was made more manifest, however, when, at a later date, the house of commons was established, for then the lesser barons no longer sat with the greater, but with the freeholders, and then not as of right, but only as representatives.

It was during the reign of Henry III. that the foundation of that popular representation which has been so long the glory and safeguard of the kingdom was laid. The first instance of which there are any authentic accounts of parliament being constituted of three estates—king, lords, and commons—occurs in the forty-ninth year of his rule. The writs bear date the 12th and 24th of December, A.D. 1264, and those issued at the latter date were addressed to the cities and towns, and were dated from Woodstock. Two discreet, loyal, and honest men were to be sent to parliament from each, to provide by wholesome deliberations for the security and completion of the peace, and for certain other business which the king was unwilling to settle without them. The Cinque Ports were to return four representatives, and counties and boroughs two members each; and thus delegates of the commons were mingled in legislation with the hereditary nobility. Only eleven prelates and twenty-three peers were summoned to this parliament, but a large number of the dignified clergy—abbots, priors, and deans—were called upon to attend. Those sent from the counties were to be "discreet knights;" those from cities, "discreet and honest citizens;" and those from boroughs, "wise and upright burgesses." The Cinque Ports were to send barons. In what manner these knights, citizens, burgesses, and barons were chosen, there is no record,

but as they appeared as the representatives of those by whom they were sent, their expenses were defrayed, by their constituents. The parliament thus summoned, met at Westminster on the 22nd of January, A.D. 1225, and sat till the 25th of February, a period of thirty-three days. The writs, although issued in the king's name, were in reality the writs of Simon de Montfort, the great earl of Leicester, who was then the real master of the kingdom; and although he stands charged with making the innovation in the practice, which up to that time had prevailed, to advance his own popularity, he must be honoured as the founder of that wise system of government which combines the elective with the hereditary principle in the constitution; unites democracy with monarchy and aristocracy; and thus giving the various orders of the community a direct interest in the management of the state. Whether this famous parliament was divided into two houses or not there is no record to show; but it is clear that the plan was a near and happy approach to that system which has been established for six hundred years, a degree of antiquity to which few legislatures can lay claim.

Several laws made in the reign of Henry III. were of an enlightened character, and some still have a place in the statute book. In those made at Merton, A.D. 1236, a controversy which had long existed concerning bastardy was finally determined. By the Roman and canon laws, children born before marriage were held to be legitimate if their parents became united in matrimony; but by the ancient customs and common law of England, all children born out of wedlock were reputed to be illegitimate, although their parents *might* afterwards marry. The prelates in the parliament at Merton strenuously endeavoured to have the regulation of the canon laws adopted into the law of England in this particular; but the temporal barons unanimously rejected such a proposition. By another statute made in this parliament, it was enacted that lords who married their wards before they were fourteen years of age, to either villains or burgesses, should lose the wardships of their lands; a proof that both the barons and their vassals at this period held burgesses in utter contempt. The *Statutum de Scaccario*, or "Statutes of the Exchequer," made A.D. 1266, is remarkable in several respects. They are the first statutes known to be written in the French language—all previous statutes being penned in Latin. Various reasons have been conjectured for this change, the most probable being that French was the better understood of the two. At this time, indeed, a general affectation prevailed of speaking the French language; so much so, that it gave rise to a proverb, that "Jack would be a gentleman if he could speak French." The "Statute of the Exchequer" was passed for a twofold object: first, to prevent undue severity in collecting the royal revenues; and second, to regulate the terms and methods of accounting at the exchequer, so as to prevent the king from being defrauded of them when collected. Ancient laws had fixed the prices of the two prime articles of consumption, bread and ale, in proportion to the prices of grain, so as to prevent the imposition of bakers and brewers. In a parliament held at Winchester, A.D. 1266, these laws were confirmed and enforced by a "Statute of the Pillory and Tumbril," by which it was enacted that bakers frequently offending should be punished by the pillory, and brewers, who in that age were women, by the tumbril or ducking-stool. By the same statute, several regulations were made for ascertaining the prices of grain; for examining weights and measures; for preventing the sale of unwholesome meats and liquors; and for restraining various arts of imposing upon the people, and increasing the prices of provisions. Other statutes, made in a parliament at Marlbridge, A.D. 1267, after the restoration of Henry's disputed authority, were designed to remedy the disorders which had prevailed during the recent period of anarchy. Thus they restrained the tyranny of the great barons by facilitating appeals from their courts to those of the king; and rendered cruelty in taking distresses punishable by law. It is evident from all this, that the statute law of England was greatly improved in the reign of Henry III.

So also was the common law. This is well illustrated by Sir Matthew Hale in his account of Bracton's treatise, written at this period. "It yields us," he says, "a great evidence of the growth of the laws between the times of Henry II. and Henry III. If we do but compare Glanville's book with that of Bracton, we shall see a very great advance in the writings of the latter over what they are in Glanville. It would be needless to instance particulars. Some of the writs and processes agree in substance; but they are much more regular and settled as they are in Bracton above what they are in Glanville. The book itself in the beginning seems to borrow its method from the civil law. But the greatest part of the substance is, either of the course of proceedings in the law known to the author, or of resolutions and decisions in the courts of king's bench and common bench, and before justices itinerant: for now the inferior courts begun to be of little use or esteem."

The fruit of this new system of government was seen in the reign of Edward I., Henry's son and successor. In that reign, great progress was made towards liberty; and during the last thirteen years of his life, the English laws received greater improvement than in any one reign up to that of the present sovereign. The legal and constitutional advances of Edward's reign are far more honourable to his memory than his warlike exploits. He has been styled the English Justinian; not because he resembled the Roman Emperor in causing a collection of existing statutes to be made, but because he remedied defective laws, corrected abuses of administration, and remodelled the judicial institutions of the country. In this reign, the four great courts of the King's Bench, the Common Pleas, the Exchequer, and the Chancery, had their functions defined as they now subsist: thus sweeping away the old *Curia Regis*, or king's court, in the administration of justice. At this period the ancient office of chief justiciary, which was invested with military, political, and judicial duties, was abolished; the chancellorship, from being a subordinate position, was raised to supreme rank, dispensing justice to the subject where no remedy was provided by the common law; the power of finally determining suits was vested in parliament;

and hostels, afterwards called inns of courts, where all the great legal authorities of the realm have become versed in the law, were first established.

In the last years of the preceding reign, and the first ten years of Edward I., the plan of a parliament introduced by the great earl Leicester appears to have been laid aside. Monarchy and aristocracy perchance felt jealous of a democracy. In the year 1283, however, that plan was revived. At that time, Edward had completed the conquest of Wales, and had taken its last prince, David, prisoner. In September, Edward called a parliament to meet at Shrewsbury, for the trial of his royal captive, and the settlement of the conquered country. The assembly summoned was similar to that which constituted "Leicester's parliament." Particular writs were issued for the great barons, spiritual and temporal; but others were directed to the sheriffs of each county, and to twenty-one cities and boroughs, commanding them to send each two representatives to that assembly. But although the plan was thus revived, it does not seem to have been adhered to in all cases: some parliaments being subsequently summoned without and some with the democratic element. How they were summoned would appear to have been either at the will of the king, or according to the gravity of the subject on which they were called upon to deliberate. Or it may be that as counties, cities, and boroughs had to defray the expenses of their representatives, it proved an obstacle to the general adoption of Leicester's plan. But from whatever cause it arose, it is certain that the constitution of parliament in the reign of Edward I. was far from being fixed and uniform. In some parliaments only the greater lords, spiritual and temporal, assembled; in others, the knights of counties were added to them; in others, abbots, priors, archdeacons, and even some of the inferior clergy swelled their numbers; while, in others, the representatives of cities and boroughs sat in council. On the whole, however, these assemblies approached nearer and nearer to that admirable model which, for a long series of years, has contributed so much to the preservation of English rights and liberties.

As regards the question as to what time parliament was divided into two houses, Mr. Hallam observes:—"It has been a very prevailing opinion that parliament was not divided into two houses at the first admission of the commons. If this is only meant that the commons did not occupy a separate chamber till the reign of Edward III., the proposition, true or false, will be of little importance. They may have sat at the bottom of Westminster Hall while the lords occupied the upper end; but that they were ever intermingled in voting appears inconsistent with likelihood and authority. The usual object of calling a parliament was to impose taxes, and these, for many years after the introduction of the commons, were laid in different proportions upon the different estates of the realm. Thus, in the reign of Edward I., the earls, barons, and knights, gave the king an eleventh; the clergy a tenth; while he obtained a seventh from the citizens and burgesses." This would indicate that, if the lords and commons sat in one hall, as it is clear they did, each body separately taxed itself for the support of the crown. In truth, the commons were wanted for the purpose of taxing themselves, and as they generally performed this office with greater liberality than the barons and clergy, as instanced above, the king had no reason to regret their presence. On the contrary, he had every inducement to require it, and hence, towards the latter period of his reign, their attendance became regular. Particular parliaments may have been summoned without them, for the enactments of statutes and affairs of state; but when money was required, the presence of the commons was indispensable. As some towns had begged to be excused the burden of sending representatives by reason of their poverty, in A.D. 1305, knights, citizens, and burgesses were allowed "wages," which were raised by assessments in their respective districts. The towns derived one great advantage by admission into the council of the nation, inasmuch as they could present petitions and set forth their grievances through their representatives. Hence it is, that sometimes during this period, parliaments were demanded by the commonalty. It is recorded that, in the parliament of A.D. 1305, which sat only for three weeks, no less than one hundred and six petitions were answered by the king and his council.

Some of the statutes of the reign of Edward I. were passed to set bounds to the power of the Pope, the riches of the clergy, and encroachments of the spiritual courts. Thus, by the statute of Mortmain, ecclesiastical corporations were prohibited from taking possession of the lands and tenements of deceased persons, the clergy having persuaded many in their dying hours to bequeath their estates to them, to the injury of their families. Other statutes explained, confirmed, and enlarged the liberties granted by the Great Charter and the Charter of Forests, and restrained the crown from imposing taxes without the consent of parliament. The statute of Winchester had for its object the regulation of the internal police of the country, and the prevention of thefts and robberies. By this statute strangers and lodgers were to be required to give sureties for their good behaviour; in cases of felony, the hue and cry was to be raised in all counties, hundreds, and markets, that no one might have an excuse for not aiding in the arrest of criminals; the gates of cities and boroughs were to be closed from sunset to sunrise, and watch kept at them according to the number of inhabitants; and all trees and brushwood, to the distance of two hundred feet on both sides of the highway, were to be removed, that they might not shelter bandits. As these police regulations were ill observed, persons styled "keepers of the peace" were appointed in each shire to see to their due execution. Such a statute was wise and prudent, for as Edward I. and his chief nobility were so much engaged in foreign wars, bands of lawless men associated together to commit agrarian and other outrages. Robin Hood outlaws were still numerous, and to repress these marauders a commission of justices was established, who itinerated through the shires, invested with powers of summary trial and punishment. The statutes of Acton-Burnel and *De Mercatoribus* had for their object the encouragement of commerce. Provisions were made by the former for the speedy recovery of debts due to traders, a subject,

however, which has laboured under peculiar difficulties down to the time at which our county courts were established, and which are not wholly swept away by that enlightened measure.

Sir Matthew Hale, writing of the great improvements that were made in the common law of England at this period, says, "Upon the whole matter it appears that the very scheme, mould, and model of the common law, especially in relation to the administration of the common justice between party and party, as it was highly rectified and set in a much better light and order by this king, than his predecessors left it to him, so in a very great measure it has continued the same in all succeeding ages to this day, so that the mark of epochs we are to take for the true stating of the law of England, what it is, is to be considered, stated, and estimated from what it was when the king left it. Before his time it was in a great measure rude and unpolished, in comparison of what it was after this reduction thereof; and on the other side as it was thus polished and ordered by him, so hath it stood hitherto without any great or considerable alteration."

The turbulent and unhappy reign of Edward II. is not distinguished by any legislative acts of importance. He was a king who had neither talents for war, politics, nor legislation; a king who was ruled by favourites, to whom he abandoned both the treasures and government of his kingdom. When it could be exercised, the common law continued in the same improved state to which it had attained in the previous reign; but the regular administration of justice was frequently disturbed by civil broils, and the rage of parties was sometimes so great that lives were sacrificed without either the pretence or form of a trial.

Party strife even turned parliament occasionally into something like a bear-garden. At the same time its constitution became more settled and uniform. A full and general parliament in this reign consisted of archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, deans, archdeacons, two representatives of the chapters of cathedrals, and two of the inferior clergy of each diocese; and of earls, barons, knights, judges, the members of the king's council, two knights from each county, two citizens from each city, and two burgesses from each borough. This certainly came nearer to a popular representation than had been previously known. The meeting of parliament also became more regular. It was ordained by the "lords ordainers" that the king should hold a parliament once a year, or "twice if need be." Some historians conceive that this was a precedent for the annual election of members of parliament clamoured for in modern times; but the stated object of the provision, and the express words of the enactment, show that the frequent meeting of parliament, and not a new election, was contemplated. There were no attempts made to fix the duration of parliaments by statute before the middle of the seventeenth century, when it was ordained that there should be a fresh election every three years. It may be that at this period parliaments were in many cases elected as often as they were assembled, but it does not appear to have formed any part of the constitution. In consequence of Edward II. appealing to the commons against the barons, and the barons appealing to them against the crown, greater power fell into the hands of the people at this period. All legislative authority was, by a statute, formally declared to reside in the crown with the assent of the prelates, earls, barons, and the commonalty of the realm: every act done without this united authority being affirmed to be null and void. Henceforth, therefore, the commons might, if they chose, participate in all acts of legislation; a privilege, however, they do not appear to have been anxious to exercise, except as regards their own taxation. It is in this reign that "peers of the land" are first mentioned, those peers being the earls and greater barons, or those who were distinguished from the other tenants-in-chief of the crown by the extent of their property, and some notable individuals, who, though they had no baronial tenure, were summoned by the king's writ to take their seat in parliament. These latter were peers for the session; for the writs of that period did not constitute the dignity of a peerage for life, but only for a single parliament, and their temporary creation appears to have been designed as a check upon the ascendancy of the hereditary earls and barons, just as in modern times peers have been created by our sovereigns for the express purpose of carrying measures to which the peers, spiritual and temporal, have by majorities rejected.

During the reign of Edward II. the "year books" were commenced, a series of reports of cases decided in the superior courts. They were published annually from the notes of persons paid by the crown. These year books contain reports of cases adjudged from the commencement of this reign to the end of Edward III., and from the beginning of Henry IV. to the close of the reign of Henry VIII. A compilation entitled the "Mirror of Justice" is by some ascribed to the reign of Edward II., although others pronounce it to be older than the Conquest. Both may be right, for the ancient compilation may have been taken up in Edward's reign, and worked into its present form. It is, however, of very little value, as its contents savour not only of the marvellous, but the monstrous. Early in the reign of Edward II., the society of Lincoln's Inn was founded. It takes its name from William, earl of Lincoln, who, being well-affected to the study of the laws, brought the professors to settle in a house which he held under lease, belonging to the bishop of Chichester. Successive bishops of that diocese let leases of this house for the use and residence of students of the law, till, in the reign of Henry VIII., the then bishop of Chichester gave it in fee to two students of Lincoln's Inn, who sold it to the benchers, in the twentieth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It may be interesting to mention that in the reign of Edward II., the keeper, or "master of the rolls," was first appointed; and that the appointment of sheriffs, hitherto chosen by freeholders, was vested in the crown.

SECTION II.

During the long reign of Edward III., several important changes were made in the constitution, government, and laws of England. It was in that

reign that the power of parliament became more fully unfolded. No great undertaking was ventured upon before he had taken the advice and obtained the concurrence and support of his subjects in parliament assembled. It is on record, that not less than seventy parliaments, or great councils, were summoned during his reign. In general, the sessions were very brief, rarely extending to a month, and sometimes not to a week, thus singularly contrasting with the sessions of modern times. As heretofore, Edward's parliaments were of two kinds. When he desired only the advice of the great men of his kingdom, he summoned the lords, spiritual and temporal, who held of the crown by barony; but when he stood in need of the counsel and aid of his subjects, he called a full parliament, which consisted not only of the lords spiritual and temporal, but also of the representatives of the inferior clergy, of the smaller barons or freeholders, and of the citizens and burgesses of the kingdom. The representatives of the clergy and laity below the rank of barons were called the "spiritual and temporal commons." At first, the number of representatives sent to parliament by each county, city, and borough, was not fixed; but it finally became a rule that each should send two members, which rule became so uniformly observed, that by custom it became a law. There is no record extant showing the number of boroughs and towns which sent members to parliament, but it is clear that they were numerous, from the power which the commons now had in the state. They had obtained an integral share in the government; a conclusive evidence that the middle classes had acquired so much wealth and consideration that the old feudal relations were becoming extinct. Towards the close of this reign, indeed, the commons became prosecutors, and were strong enough to remove an administration, and to impeach offenders—such as, for instance, ill-advisers of the crown—who were thought to be out of the reach of the ordinary course of the law.

Some historians conceive it was at this period that the division of parliament was effected. This supposition is founded on the circumstance, that in A.D. 1331, it is for the first time recorded that the knights, citizens, and burgesses withdrew to a separate chamber to deliberate. It is clear, however, that the lords and commons were always distinct bodies, for, although it was usual to sit in one place, they deliberated and voted apart. At the same time, the two houses of lords and commons were more completely formed during this reign than they had before been. This is made manifest by a parliament held at Westminster, April, A.D. 1343. On that occasion Edward sent one of his ministers to ask their advice, whether he should make peace with the king of France under the mediation of the Pope or not? And in order that the lords and commons might give this weighty matter due and proper consideration, and that he might know the true sentiments of his subjects, the prelates and barons were desired to deliberate in the hall by themselves; and the knights of counties, and commons of cities and boroughs to assemble in the painted chamber for the same purpose. This separation of the two houses was attended with many advantages, and greatly contributed to the improvement of the constitution. While sitting together in one hall, it may reasonably be supposed that the commons in those ages stood in awe of the potent and haughty barons, and to have been somewhat fearful of expressing their sentiments freely, and voting in opposition to them. It was nothing but natural that the lesser knights, citizens, and burgesses should have paid deference to the lords spiritual and temporal. By sitting apart they became free from all restraint; could speak and act with more perfect freedom. From that time, indeed, the commons took courage, and gradually acquired greater weight and influence. Every law was discussed and examined by two distinct assemblies, each jealous of the other's power, and watchful over each other's conduct, before it was presented to the king for his approval and confirmation. The two houses, therefore, became a check upon each other, neither of them being permitted to invade the privileges of the other, nor the prerogatives of the crown. In a word, by this division of the parliament of England into the two assemblies of lords and commons, with the king at their head, the rights of the people were secured, and the English constitution acquired the peculiar advantages of the three most famous forms of government which has even figured in profane history—monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy—without any of their numerous individual disadvantages. In truth, by such a form of government, the king, lords, and commons became "one and indivisible."

KING AND COUNCIL.

During the reign of Edward III., many important statutes were passed, some of which contributed to the improvement of the common law, and others to the security of the rights and privileges of the people. Other statutes restrained the authority and rapacity of the papal court, the chief of which rendered appeals to Rome penal, and prohibited the Pope from making any presentations to benefices. By other laws, the administration of justice was rendered more speedy and impartial; provision was made against the evil consequences of dangerous associations then common for supporting each other in their law-suits; the king's prerogative of pardoning convicted criminals, which had been often abused, was limited; the insti-

f justices of the peace was improved, and their
nlarged; and the oppressive system of pur-
for the king's household was mitigated.
the most important statute of this reign was
atute of Treasons," which was passed by the
parliament, A.D. 1351." This statute defined
irst time in any European kingdom the acts
ing the highest offence against the state, and
es were thereby deprived of the power of
constructive treasons. The act divides
into "high" and "petit," a distinction by
hey have since been known. The chief
of high treason were these:—To compass or
the death of the king, queen, or that of their
n and heir; to violate the king's companion,
t unmarried daughter, or the wife of the
dest son and heir; to levy war against the
his realm, or to aid and succour his enemies
is realm, or elsewhere; to bring into the
lse money counterfeit to the money of
, knowing it to be false, to merchandise or
rment in deceit of the king and his people;
lay the chancellor, treasurer, or any of the
stices, in eyre or assize, or any other justices
to hear and determine, being in their places,
ir offices. Petit treason was defined to be
ervant slays his master; a wife her husband;
a man, secular or religious, slays his prelate
he owes faith and obedience. The property
found guilty of high treason was to be for-
the king; and of those found guilty of petit
o the lord of the fee. Other statutes ordained
liament should be holden once a year; and
s should be "pleaded in the English tongue."
statutes, with others, were rational, and
hem wise and good; but there were some
le in the reign of Edward III., and which
l in the statute-book, which were of an im-
le character, and have long become obsolete.
hese are the laws relating to the staple of
other goods; "The Statute of Labourers,"
in a previous page; and a law which fixed
s of provisions. Among the most curious
sumptuary laws, which prescribed the dress
of persons of different ranks. The "Statute
l," passed A.D. 1363, had for its object the
g "the outrageous and excessive apparel of
ople against their estate and degree." It
ith prescribing what dress was to be worn
ts called grooms, as well servants of lords as
rs and tradesmen. Grooms, with their
re to use only cloth of a certain low price,
old or silver, or silk embroidery. Labourers
ndry, carters, ploughmen, shepherds, and
were not to dress, if they had not forty
of goods or chattels, in anything else but
and russet, and girdles of linen. Yeomen
e of handicraft might dress better, but they
ear no vesture of higher price than forty
without things of gold and silver and costly
ending higher in rank came the knight,
it, if he possessed four hundred marks a
what he pleased except ermine, and their
ght adorn their heads with pearls and
stones. Such legislative acts as these savoured of tyranny, and it is no wonder that they soon became obsolete, and are now only valuable as monuments of antiquity.

The state of the common law in this period is thus ably summed up by the learned Sir Matthew Hale:—"King Edward III. succeeded his father. His reign was long, and under it the law was improved to its greatest height. The judges and pleaders were very learned. The pleadings are somewhat more polished than those in the time of Edward II.; yet they have neither uncertainty, prolixity, nor obscurity. They were plain and skilful; and in the rules of law, especially in relation to actions and titles of inheritance, very learned, and excellently polished, and exceeded those of the time of Edward I. So that at the latter end of this king's reign, the law seemed to be near its meridian."

PARLIAMENT OF THE PERIOD.

If the reign of Richard II. was not glorious for battles and sieges, as regards the progress of the people, it is one of the most interesting in the English annals. It was in this reign that the great constitutional principles of our government were clearly developed; and that the power of the commons was displayed more fully than at any previous period. If supplies were voted, it was only on the condition that there should be administrative reforms as accompaniments. Grants and equivalents went hand in hand. In this reign, also, the commons were stern in the impeachment of the evil advisers of the crown; and in insisting that the public liberties, secured by statutes and by charters, should not be encroached upon. It is true that for a brief season Richard became an uncontrollable tyrant, trampling the laws and liberties of the people under his feet; but in the end, his tyranny worked for the general good. By his deposition, which, though it was accompanied by treachery and violence, was a national act, it was seen that all the various orders of society worked harmoniously in the maintenance of freedom. In his reign, the voice of the people could no longer be silenced: even the peasant class made themselves heard in the midst of tumult and bloodshed, and,

although their revolt was happily suppressed, from that time the condition of the serf underwent a real mitigation, until at length the serf became a free labourer, and gradually acquired at least *some* of the rights of an independent citizen. As for the parliament of England, after having undergone many changes, and assuming various forms, at the very commencement of Richard's reign, it approached very near to that form in which it now exists—namely, of lords and commons who meet regularly and hold their deliberations in two separate apartments, working in unison for the general weal, but independent of each other. The house of commons, indeed, was now so completely formed, that at the beginning of every parliament, one of their own body was chosen "Speaker of the House," to preside in their debates, and communicate what they desired, in their name, to the king and the house of lords. The first speaker chosen by the commons was Sir Peter de la Mere, knight of the shire for the county of Hereford; who, on his first appearance before the king in the house of lords, at the head of the commons, made the following protestation:—"That what he had to declare was from the whole body of the commons, and, therefore, required that if he should happen to speak any thing without their consents, that it should be amended before his departure from that house." Both in this and the preceding reign, the commons appear, notwithstanding their zeal for the liberties of the people, to have paid much deference to the king and the house of lords: an example which, as a rule, has been copied by the lower house through successive ages. At the same time they were not a subservient body; but, on the whole, did battle well and manfully in checking the encroachments of the crown. It was probably as a counterpoise to the growing power of the commons that in this reign the creation of peers by patent was introduced—lord Beauchamp of Holt being the first peer thus advanced to the house of lords.

In the reign of Richard II. the important statute of *Præmunire* was passed, by which the introduction of papal bulls for translating bishops, and other purposes, was prohibited under heavy penalties. Braybroke, bishop of London, introduced a bill to parliament, authorizing the arrest and imprisonment of all persons who should be certified in his court as heretics: a bill which had for its object the persecution of the followers of Wycliffe. It was passed by the lords, but rejected by the commons; and yet, at the close of the session, it was entered on the parliament roll as a regular statute, and, as will be found in the chapter on religion, most vigorously executed. Many laws made in the reign of Richard II. have still a place in our statute-book; but the greater number of them have become obsolete. Some of these laws were passed for the encouragement of navigation, trade, and commerce; and others for regulating the proceedings and increasing the numbers of the justices of the peace. Some of the laws passed at this period were wise and just enactments, but others were absurd and even pernicious. Among these latter were statutes passed for the regulation of wages, the price of provisions, and meddling with social affairs. The law even provided for the martial array and sports of every servant of husbandry, labourer, or servant of artificer. They were not to bear buckler, sword, or dagger, except in time of war for the defence of the realm; but they were allowed to have bows and arrows, and to use them on Sundays and holidays. Every game was to give way to that of the bow and arrow; for all idle games of tennis, football, quoits, skittles, and casting of the stone, were to be discontinued. By one enactment of this period, it was ordained that artificers and men of craft, servants, and apprentices, should be compelled to aid in gathering in the harvest; and by another, male and female servants and labourers were not to depart at the end of their term to go to another place, without letters testimonial under the king's seal, to be obtained of some "good man of the hundred, rape, wapentake, city, or borough." Every one found travelling from place to place without such letters was to be put in the stocks. The folly of some of the laws of this period was discovered by these ancient legislators themselves, and if they were not repealed, they were not enforced. It was found that wages could not be regulated by statute law; that the prices of provisions and articles of necessity could not be fixed by acts of parliament; that no sumptuary laws could determine the diet and apparel of the various classes of society; and that no ordinance could define the price at which cloth of different qualities was to be sold. But in some of their enactments, the legislators of the reign of Richard II. exhibited considerable wisdom and humanity. In his reign there is even a glimpse of a poor law. "Beggars impotent to serve" were to remain in the cities or towns where they dwelt, but if these cities and towns could not provide for them, then they might go to other towns within the hundred, rape, or wapentake, or to the place where they were born, there to find sustenance. In the year 1388, a law was passed to improve the sanitary condition of the country. It had been the practice to throw all filth and refuse of every kind into the ditches, rivers, and other waters within and around divers cities, towns, and boroughs, of the realm, by which many maladies and intolerable diseases had been engendered; but by this law, whoever "cast and lay such annoyances," was immediately to remove them under a penalty of twenty pounds to be paid to the king.

During the reign of Richard II. the common law rather declined than improved. On this subject Sir Matthew Hale says, "Richard II. succeeding his grandfather, the dignity of the law, together with the honour of the kingdom, by reason of the weakness of this prince, and the difficulties occurring in his government, seemed somewhat to decline, as may appear by comparing the twelve last years of Edward III., commonly called *quadragesms*, with the reports of King Richard II., wherein appears a visible declination of the learning and depth of the judges and pleaders."

As regards the royal revenue of this period, it became intimately blended with that of the constitution and government. Its several kings were chiefly dependent for their incomes upon parliamentary grants. If these grants were withheld, as they frequently were, the royal treasury became empty

hey were reduced to a state of bankruptcy. The incomes of the monarchs of this period cannot ted, as the grants were not made in so much y, but such and such taxes, as seen in previous . In the first years of the period grants were sparingly. The terms on which Henry III. with his barons were not favourable for the l supply of his exchequer, and he was often d to the most pitiable state of destitution. ds the close of his reign, indeed, his principal ce was the plunder of the clergy—his friend, Alexander IV., aiding him in his exactions—and Jews, both of which classes were at his mercy. e reign of Edward I. the barons were more . His wars with Scotland and France being r, parliament was induced, from time to time, to enormous supplies, and the people submitted heavy taxation and arbitrary exactions with- uch murmuring. Still, large as the supplies which he obtained from parliament, they were nerally sufficient to meet his expenditure; and , plundered the Church, and the Jews, so long y remained in the country, to replenish his uer. It was, however, upon the liberality of rliament that Edward mainly relied, and the s demanded were generally conceded. The evied in this reign must, from first to last, have ed a very large amount, and, combined with actions, which were of no trifling character, ore than supplied his various wants. Despite avy expenses of his military operations, when d it is said that he left a hundred thousand of accumulated treasure, which he had in- to devote to the prosecution of the war in d. During the rule of Edward II. few grants nade by parliament; but the fifty years of the f Edward III. were a period of legal taxation rge scale, and of many illegal imposts. Grants rliament now almost became annual, many of being of a most liberal character towards the but oppressive to the people. Edward III. sorted to many arbitrary methods of raising . He sold monopolies and knighthoods, re- the practice of imposing tallages on cities and hs, extorted money from the clergy by forced nd on some occasions made direct seizures of ndize and other property. Yet with all his ous resources he was constantly in want of , and oppressed by debts. As before related, on casion he pawned his queen's jewels to relieve f from the straits in which he was involved; another pledged his crown, which for eight remained unredeemed, so that by his lavish iture he became a king without a crown. Of ll-tax, levied in the reign of Richard II., full lars have been recorded. It was preceded by ar tax, which is said to be the first that was uished by the name of a subsidy, which after- became the common name for a parliamentary Richard's lavish expenditure and the liberality servile parliament, have been noticed in his . The grant made to him for life, A.D. 1382, exportation of wool, woolfells, and leather, was d by an act offering a discount from the duties e articles to all merchants who would pay the Calais dues in advance. This was the first attempt made to anticipate the revenue, a practice which subsequently gave rise to that heavy burden imposed upon the past, present, and future generations—the national debt.

From what is known of the constitution, government, and laws of Scotland, at the commencement of this period, they appear to have been similar to those of England. In the contemporary reigns of Henry III. and Alexander II., the two nations observed the most friendly relations toward each other. The matrimonial alliances between the two royal families had the happiest effect. There was a free and constant intercourse between the two courts and kingdoms, by which they became acquainted with each other's laws and customs. That the parliament of Scotland was constituted according to the plan of that of England, as established by the Great Charter, seems clear, for the laws ascribed to Alexander II. are said to have been made by "venerable fathers, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, and his good subjects." The laws also of the two countries bear so strong a resemblance to each other, that there can be no doubt those of Scotland were, as a rule, derived from England. The forest laws, for instance, are in many points one and the same; and in the borough laws of Scotland the "baxter," or baker, was to be put in the pillory for the third offence of imposing on the public, and the "brewster," or brewer, upon the "cock stule," or ducking-stool, as by the statute of Henry III. concerning the assize of bread and ale, such offenders were punished in England. Civil causes were likewise tried by juries in Scotland as well as in England; and jurymen in both countries were liable to be tried and severely punished for false or unjust verdicts. Both nations, moreover, prohibited trials by ordeals of fire and water, but those by single combat were still allowed, and were frequent. But, although the laws of both countries were similar, they were not an exact counterpart of each other. This is evidenced in the reign of Edward I., who vainly attempted the conquest of Scotland. It is related that in those parts where his power *did* prevail, he endeavoured to introduce the English laws, customs, and modes of judicial proceedings as they really existed in England; that being deemed essential by him as a means of securing his conquest. He had accomplished this in Wales; but all his efforts to unite Scotland to England, whether by the sword or by policy, served only to kindle an inveterate animosity between the two nations. It would seem, indeed, that his attempt to conquer Scotland had the effect of rendering the manners, laws, and customs of the Scots more dissimilar to those of England than they had been in the reign of his predecessor. Scotland was at that time in a state of anarchy and confusion; but when, in the reign of Edward II., the renowned Robert Bruce, by the victory of Bannockburn, was firmly seated on the Scottish throne, he re-established order, and the regular administration of justice. Robert, with the assistance of parliament, framed numerous laws, many of which were borrowed from the statutes of Henry III. and Edward I., and some even transcribed almost verbatim; a proof of the magnanimity of his mind, inasmuch as he did not disdain to borrow laws

from his enemies. In the reign of Robert Bruce burgesses were introduced into his parliament, as well as other freeholders of the kingdom, thus still closely resembling the parliament of England. After the death of this great prince, Scotland again fell into a state of anarchy and confusion. The contest between the Bruce and Baliol families was fatal to order and good government. David Bruce finally prevailed in that contest, but as he spent nine years of his reign an exile in France, and eleven years as a prisoner in England; and as his reign of forty years was by no means fortunate, it is not marked by any noted acts of legislation. A collection of laws was made by his successor, Robert II., in a parliament at Scone, which consisted of "prelates, and procurators of prelates, and others of the clergy, earls, barons, and burgesses," which collection is published among the ancient laws of Scotland. At the conclusion of this parliament, Robert promised, on the word of a prince, that he would observe the laws made in it; and his eldest son, afterwards Robert III., with all the members present, took a solemn oath on the gospels that they, too, would observe them, a proof that the laws of Scotland at the close of this period had not due weight and authority, else why was the promise of the king, and the oaths of his parliament that they would govern and be governed by them, needful?

CHAPTER III.

History of Religion from the Accession of Henry III., A.D. 1216, to the Deposition of Richard II., A.D. 1399.

SECTION I.

IN the thirteenth century the papal dominion had reached its height in Europe, and in no country was it more fully displayed than in England. King John had conferred on the see of Rome a power which it exerted to its utmost limits. At the same time, though his son and successor, Henry III., swore fealty to the Pope as his superior lord at his coronation, the English barons were not disposed to be wholly subservient. They had affected to revere his dictates as the command of God, and to dread his fulminations as the thunders of heaven, when directed against King John; but when they were aimed against themselves they were treated with the most sovereign contempt. There was a coldness engendered in the breasts of the barons of England towards the pontiff by his support of John and his successor, which was very early manifested, especially by those barons who had supported the cause of Louis of France, who had been invited to England to take possession of the throne. And in that coldness those of the clergy who had acted with them participated, and not without reason, for when Louis left the kingdom, both orders were compelled to pay large sums for having dared to despise the pontiff's authority. In one instance they ventured to thwart the court of Rome's avaricious designs. A project was formed early in the reign of Henry III., by the papal court, of obtaining the revenues of two prebendaries in every cathedral, and of two monks in every monastery, in all countries in communion with the Church of Rome, for the better support of its dignity. Such a project, if it had been carried out in England, would have filled the papal coffers to overflow; but when, in the year 1326, it was laid before the English parliament, the legate was coolly and evasively informed that as the affair concerned all Christendom, they would conform to the resolution of other countries.

Still the pontiff of Rome was at this period all-powerful in England. It was the great field for papal imposition and plunder. Every bishopric was either filled up by the direct nomination of the Pope, or, in the case of a disputed election, by his arbitration. Thus it was at the death of Cardinal Langton, A.D. 1228. At his decease, the monks of Canterbury made a hasty election of Walter de Hemesham, one of their own fraternity; but as both the king and the bishops of the province were ill satisfied, there was, as usual, an appeal to Rome by all parties. At first the Pope declared the case to be one he scarcely knew how to determine. It was, he said, surrounded with doubts and difficulties. But these were easily removed: for when Henry, by his commissioners, promised his holiness a tenth of all the moveables, both of the clergy and laity, he at once declared Hemesham's election void, and to prevent all further contests, he appointed Richard le Grand, chancellor of Lincoln, to be archbishop. Henry's promise was exacted to the very letter. A legate was forthwith sent into England to collect the tenths; and although the payment was sternly opposed by the barons in parliament assembled, the united weight of the papal and regal power was brought to bear upon them, and the tax was levied to the last penny. That he might not lose any portion thereof, the legate compelled the bishops to pay for the inferior clergy, and when any of them complained of poverty, he introduced Italian usurers to them, who lent them money at an exorbitant interest.

Le Grand died A.D. 1231, and the monks of Canterbury made four successive elections, which were all set aside by the Pope. Those elected were not sufficiently attached to the interests of the court of Rome: and after two years' vacancy, Edmund Rich, treasurer of Salisbury, was appointed by the Pope and consecrated. Nor was it only the higher stations of the Church that were filled up by the sovereign pontiff. The rights of private patrons, as well as those of the crown, were invaded by him. All the valuable livings in the kingdom were at his disposal,

ter part of which were bestowed upon Italians. ear 1237, Cardinal Otho arrived in England, ng the three years he remained in the country, han three hundred Italians were provided for Church. Otho's principal business was to nglish gold. Assemblies of the clergy were l, but it was chiefly for the purpose of obtain-

CONVOCATION OF CLERGY.

ey. True, he held a council at London on his in which many canons were framed; but few a contained anything new or remarkable, that by one the clergy were forbidden to clandestine marriages, and by another, to a concubines publicly, both of which practices ll very frequent. So grievous were the exactions s at this period, that even Rich, who was the nominee to the archbishopric of Canterbury, kingdom in disgust, and retired to a monastery ce, where he died, A.D. 1240.

Queen's uncle, Boniface, now became archbishop erbury, and, during his primacy, nuncios and came one after another to pillage the kingdom. xactions were so continuous and severe, that at barons at length made a stand against In the year 1245, they sent orders to the s of the seaports to seize all persons bringing mandates from Rome, and one messenger who with a cargo of them, directed to Martin the was arrested; but on the interference of the as set at liberty. Martin received his bulls, mpowered him to exact more money from the n various pretences, and it was in vain that ns sought to remedy the evil. Representations de to the king, that the court of Rome was ishing the country; but though he professed ment at the figures laid before him, showing edible sums extorted from his subjects, those urch preferments possessed by Italians in England amounting to more than the ordinary revenues of the crown, no steps were taken by him to redress the grievances. The barons, however, were still determined to go on with their work. Under pretence of holding a tournament, they met at Dunstable, from whence they sent a knight to the legate, commanding him to leave the kingdom; and so boldly did he execute his commission, that Martin, fearing the fury of the nation, with which he was threatened, obeyed the command. In order to prevent the return of these oppressions, the barons sent ambassadors to a general council at Lyons, in which the Pope presided in person, to represent the grievances to which the church and kingdom of England was subjected, and to declare that they would no longer endure them, but no redress was obtained. It is said that the Pope blushed for shame when Powerie, one of the ambassadors, eloquently descanted on the innumerable frauds and insatiable avarice of the court of Rome but in the very next year his agents were again in England at the old work of extortion. This time the king and the clergy united their complaints with the barons. Letters of remonstrance were sent to Rome, but they were treated with scorn by the pontiff, who became daily more imperious and tyrannical. In that same year, A.D. 1246, he boldly demanded half of all the revenues of the non-resident clergy, and one-third of those who resided on their livings; but the resistance to this demand by the king, clergy, and barons, was so stern, that he prudently desisted from enforcing it.

One prelate at this period deserves particular notice for his resistance to the encroachments of the court of Rome. This was Grotêste, bishop of Lincoln, a man of such unfeigned piety, untainted probity, and undaunted courage, as would have rendered him an ornament to the Church in any age of its history. Grotêste was in the habit of keenly examining all bulls he received from Rome, and of tearing them to pieces if they contained anything contrary to the precepts of the Gospel, or injurious to the interests of religion. Innocent IV. sent him a bull which contained in it the scandalous clause of *Non Obstante*, lately introduced into the papal mandates, which was everywhere exclaimed against; and in which he commanded the bishop to bestow a rich living in his gift upon the Pope's nephew, who was then an infant. Never was a pope so sternly rebuked as Innocent was by the heroic bishop of Lincoln on this occasion. His reply by letter was expressed in terms of stern severity. Referring to the clause of *Non Obstante*, the prelate remarked that it brought a deluge of mischief upon Christendom, and gave occasion to inconstancy and breach of faith. It shook, he said, the very foundations of trust and security amongst mankind, and made language and letters insignificant. As for that part of the bull which commanded him to bestow a benefice upon an infant, he remarked: "Next to the sins of Lucifer and Antichrist, there cannot be a greater defection, or which carries a more direct opposition to the doctrine of our Saviour and his apostles, than to destroy souls by depriving them of the benefits of the pastoral office; and yet those persons are guilty of this sin who undertake the sacerdotal function, and receive the profits without

discharging the duty. From hence it is evident that those who bring such unqualified persons into the Church, and debauch the hierarchy, are much to blame; and that their crimes rise in proportion to the height of their station." Unaccustomed to such bold speaking, Innocent in his rage swore by St. Peter and St. Paul that he would utterly confound the impertinent old prelate, and make him "a talk and astonishment and example to all the world." He intimated that his vassal, Henry, would, at his command, cast him into prison; and had it not been for his cardinals, it is probable that command would have been given, but they counselled silence. If Innocent, they said, persecuted a prelate so renowned for piety, learning, and holiness of life, it might create many enemies against the court of Rome. So the matter was passed over. Grotêste triumphed over the power which at that period humbled kings and emperors to the dust.

But while the prelate of Lincoln opposed the high pretensions of the papacy, they found a stanch supporter in the primate of England. In a provincial synod held by Boniface at Merton in Surrey, A.D. 1258, several canons were made, the manifest tendency of which was to emancipate the Church and clergy from civil authority, and to render the yoke of ecclesiastical tyranny more bitter to the laity. Great alarm was created by these canons, and the barons addressed a letter to the Pope complaining of the extension of church power, and of the ignorance and immorality of the clergy; and threatening to withdraw the revenues bestowed upon the Church by the piety of their ancestors, since they were so much abused; but his holiness replied that he did not suppose the clergy of England were more ignorant or immoral than they had been in former ages, and that, as regarded the withdrawal of the revenues of the Church, what had been once dedicated to the service of God was irrevocable. Thus supported by the court of Rome, which might have been foreseen, the primate held another provincial synod at Lambeth, A.D. 1261, in which the canons of Merton were confirmed and enlarged; the secular power was not to meddle with the affairs of the Church, or to have any authority over the clergy.

Meanwhile, the exactions of the court of Rome went on increasing in rigour. The present of the crown of Sicily to Prince Edmund, A.D. 1254, gave the Pope an opportunity of draining England of its wealth for several years. It is said that he obtained during that time about 900,000 marks, a sum equivalent to twelve millions sterling of present money. Even during the civil wars, when the barons were in the ascendant, the exactions to some extent continued; and when, by the victory of Evesham, Henry was restored to the royal authority, a legate was sent to England for the twofold purpose of congratulating him, and of obtaining more of the wealth of the kingdom. In the year 1268 a national council was held at St. Paul's, London, in which many canons were framed, ostensibly for reforming some abuses in the Church, such as pluralities, non-residence, and the clergy holding civil offices; but in reality for framing others to increase the power and revenues of the Pope, by granting dispensations.

The primate Boniface died soon after his patron, King Henry, and then there was another dispute about a successor. The monks of Canterbury elected their sub-prior, William Cliffenden; the Pope nominated a black friar, Robert Kilwarby, to the primacy. As Edward I. was warring in Palestine, the guardians of the kingdom consented to the nomination, but at the same time protested against the encroachment, and insisted that it should not be drawn into a precedent. To preserve their own rights, the monks of Canterbury also proceeded to a fresh election, their choice now falling on the Pope's nominee. Though, therefore, the kings and the clergy of England submitted to papal encroachments, they had not yet lost sight of their own undoubted rights. At all events, if King John and his successor, Henry, had given up their rights to the holy see, it will be seen that Edward was jealous of his prerogatives.

At the commencement of Edward's reign, the power of the Pope and the Church was at its greatest height in England. The people groaned under ecclesiastical tyranny. Their oppressions were numerous and grievous, and they longed for emancipation from them. Their complaints had been for a long time uttered, but never redressed. But the time was approaching when something must be done, if the wealth of the kingdom and the power of the state were not to be wholly absorbed by the see of Rome. And there was now a king of England who, if he could not wholly emancipate his kingdom from the spiritual thraldom under which it languished, could at least reduce the tyranny under which it groaned. And King Edward early commenced the work of reformation. By one of the statutes of Westminster, A.D. 1275, bounds were set to the immunities of the clergy by enacting that when one of their order was indicted for felony in the king's court, he should undergo an inquest and trial by lawful men, before he was delivered to his ordinary. This was followed, four years after, by the famous Statute of Mortmain, whereby a stop was put to the further increase of the possessions of the Church. By that statute it was enacted that no one was either to give, sell, bequeath, or change, or by any title whatsoever assign any land, tenements, or rents to any religious body, without a licence from the king. This would appear to have been an arbitrary enactment, but it was a very necessary one, for the Church bid fair at this period to obtain possession of the greater part of the wealth and rent-roll of the kingdom.

The avarice and ambition of the court of Rome were boundless. The sums of money carried out of the country annually to that court were enormous. Pilgrims went thither laden with gold, and so did prelates, who went to Rome to obtain consecration and the confirmation of their elections. Then, again, almost all church preferments were in the hands of the sovereign pontiff, and whoever wished to share in his bounties had first to be bountiful. Moreover, those who prosecuted appeals and lawsuits at the court of Rome, if they wished to succeed, had to pave their way to success with gold. Add to all this the sums of money levied by legates and nuncios on various pretences, and other sums derived from the first-fruits of benefices, from the Peter's Pence, and the annual tribute im-

posed upon King John and his successors, and by various other means, it would seem clear that the kingdom was in a fair way of being robbed of all its treasures.

Nor was this all. In the thirteenth century, new orders of monks were transplanted from the Continent into England, whose chief business was to maintain the authority of the Pope, and to enrich themselves. These were the mendicant orders—"the maggots of corrupted times." There were four divisions of these mendicant clergy,—the Franciscans, or Friars Minors; the Dominicans, or Black Friars; the Carmelites, or White Friars; and the Augustins, or Grey Friars. Of these, the two former were the most considerable, the Franciscans being the chief of all. The first settlement of the Franciscans was at Canterbury, A.D. 1234: the Dominicans settled at Oxford thirteen years earlier. Humble men, to all appearance, were these mendicants when they first arrived in England. All worldly views were renounced by them: they depended on the alms of the people. But that was the very way to obtain riches. Charmed with their disinterestedness and humble demeanour, the people were cheerful givers. The vow of their order scarcely allowed them to sow seed or plant vineyards; but it did not extend to the building of houses. Accordingly, we find that all the four orders of the mendicants, by the munificence of the people, were soon in possession of some of the most magnificent religious houses in the kingdom. It became the ambition of the great and noble that their bones should rest within their walls, and especially in the chapels of St. Francis. "To die in the weeds of a Franciscan was to die the death of the righteous; and to repose after death in a Franciscan monastery was to have angels for the guardians of your sepulchre." All this might be very well, but your friar was a sturdy beggar; and when he became rich, he dropped his religious character and assumed the politician. He engaged in diplomacy, mixed in the intrigues of courts, discussed treaties, formed alliances, and sternly defended the authority of the Pope against all the princes and prelates of the kingdom. He was placed in a position by the Pope to war against the regular clergy. He could erect his ambulatory pulpit at any cross in any parish, and rail at the supineness and ignorance of the resident pastor; and he could confess any one who might come to him. If a parish priest refused absolution to any vile sinner in his flock, however vile he might be, all he had to do was to go to a Franciscan, and he received it at once. Nor was it the parish priest only who was attacked by the sturdy friar; he had nobler game in the cathedral clergy, whom he finally reduced to poverty. There was continual war between the mendicant orders and the regular clergy, their chief weapon being ridicule, and the chief object at which both parties aimed in striving for the victory being to obtain possession of the wealth of the kingdom.

It was time, therefore, that an attempt was made to reform this state of things. But in doing so, Edward I. met with stern opposition from the clergy. In the year 1278 Kilwarby, archbishop of Canterbury, became Cardinal, and on the nomination of the Pope, John Peckham, a Franciscan friar, was consecrated to that high dignity. Peckham was archbishop when, in the year 1279, the Statute of Mortmain was enacted; and in that same parliament he had the mortification of seeing some of the articles of canons previously made by him in a provincial synod held at Reading, blotted out, and others changed, to which alterations he was compelled to declare his assent. The inclination which Edward and his parliament displayed to curb the increasing power, and diminish the wealth of the clergy, was wormwood and gall to the Franciscan primate; and although he dissembled his rage for the moment, two years after we find him engaged in an angry controversy with the king on the subject. In a letter addressed to Edward, after stating that the Church was oppressed contrary to the decrees of the popes, the canons of councils, and the sanction of orthodox fathers, in which there was supreme authority, truth, and sanctity, he declared that no oaths should bind him to do anything against the interests and liberties of the Church, and offered to absolve the king from any oath *he* may have taken that could anywise incite him against its interests and liberties. Peckham's letter was fruitless, for Edward still continued to abridge the power and wealth of the clergy. During the primacy of Robert Winchelsea, who succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury, A.D. 1294, after the see had been vacant for two years, Edward made several demands upon the clergy for the support of his wars, on one occasion even demanding one-half of their revenues, both spiritual and temporal. Some resistance was offered to this demand, but it was in vain. In the hope of preventing all future exactions, Pope Boniface VIII., one of the greatest champions of the immunities of the Church that ever filled the papal chair, armed the primate with a bull prohibiting all princes to levy any taxes without leave of the holy see, and forbidding the clergy to pay them if demanded, threatening both princes and clergy with excommunication in case of disobedience. This bull produced a trial of strength between Edward and the Church. In a parliament held at St. Edmundsbury, A.D. 1296, a demand was made of a fifth of all the moveables of the clergy, which was refused, the primate producing the Pope's bull as the ground of their refusal. But Edward was not to be trifled with in such a matter. He gave the clergy time to consider, and when he found that his demand was still resisted, he declared, in a parliament held in January, A.D. 1297, that since the clergy would not contribute anything towards the government, they should not receive its protection. Orders were given to the judges to do every man justice against the clergy, but to do them justice against no man; and writs were directed to the sheriffs, commanding them to seize all the lay fees of the clergy, as well secular as regular, together with all their goods and chattels, and to retain possession of them till they received orders from him. This had the desired effect. The clergy were reduced to such distress by this bold measure, that they were glad to pay the fifth demanded to obtain repossession of their estates and goods; the primate, however, being among the last to yield obedience. Subsequently the archbishop had his revenge by issuing a mandate to all the bishops of his province, commanding them to

publicly denounce excommunication on all who seized the goods of ecclesiastics, or who infringed the Great Charter, or the Charter of Forests, or who should be guilty of beating or imprisoning the clergy. That these sentences of exconmunication might have their fullest effect, they were to be pronounced with bells tolling and candles lighted; "for," said the primate, "laymen have greater regard to this solemnity than to the effect of such sentences," a virtual confession of their impotency, even when the power of the Pope and the clergy was at its highest. That the king had the greater power was clear, for when the sheriffs were empowered to seize the possessions of the clergy they found ready support among the people in the execution of their office. Archbishop Winchelsea's defence of the immunities of the Church finally led to his disgrace. Having joined with the barons who opposed Edward's arbitrary measures, and obliged him frequently to confirm the charters, Edward accused him before Pope Clement V. of various crimes, and especially of disturbing the peace of his kingdom; and as that pontiff was born in Edward's French dominions, and was disposed to favour him, the pontiff suspended him from the execution of his office, deprived him of the temporalities of his see, and cited him to appear at Rome.

In the absence of the primate, Edward and his parliament went more vigorously to work in correcting the abuses of the Church. In a parliament held at Carlisle, A.D. 1307, a list of grievances was drawn up and sent to the Pope, accompanied with a very spirited letter of remonstrance, to obtain redress. In this list of grievances complaints were made of the practice of bestowing the best spiritual preferments on Italians and other foreigners, to the great prejudice of the founders, benefactors, and successors, who had the right of advowson and the gifts of such preferments: of giving the rents and revenues of religious houses to divers cardinals: of the Pope's appropriation of the first-fruits of vacant benefices for his personal benefit, to the prejudice of the king, kingdom, and the English church; of exacting three times more of Peter's Pence than the original grant warranted; of converting legacies given to pious uses to others than the testator or donor intended; of the Pope's clerks receiving half the debts, more or less, of creditors, to get the rest, and of exacting them with undue severity; and of the same clerks appropriating certain legacies to themselves, contrary to the design of the deceased. The Pope's nuncio was called before this parliament, and rebuked for these acts of extortion. He was, indeed, commanded to desist from them, and his inferior agents were ordered to be prosecuted with great severity. The spirit which this parliament displayed had the effect of checking the exactions during the remainder of the reign of Edward I., but they were renewed when his son, Edward of Caernarvon, ascended the throne.

The doctrines of the Church in the thirteenth century differed but little from those of the former age. The clergy were too keenly engaged in the acquisition of power and wealth to attend to matters of religious faith. If the people were but liberal to the Church, they were led to believe they could be saved without a creed. As regards transubstantiation however, there was a material change in the sentiments of the Church. At its commencement, the Church taught that the bread was transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ; but towards its close, it was held that both the body and blood of our Lord was given in the bread alone, and that the wine given at the same time to drink was not the sacrament, but mere wine. In the worship and discipline of the Church, the changes were manifold. For instance, the number of festivals was greatly increased; bells were tolled at the elevation of the host; confession was more strictly and generally enjoined; and none were allowed to communicate who had not previously been to the confessional. Suspensions and deprivations for offences committed by the clergy first came into use at this period: that of marrying being the most heinous crime of which they could be guilty. If a priest married, he was not only to be deprived of his benefice, but all his goods were to be forfeited to the Church, and his children were to be incapable of Church preferments. At this period, also, general excommunications came into use. All who were guilty of certain views and crimes, though known only to God and their own consciences, were to be denounced as excommunicate by bell, book, and candle, by every parish priest on the four festivals of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and Allhallows Day. Such excommunications contained the most terrible imprecations in the mother tongue that could be devised. They were to be accursed eating and drinking, walking and sitting, speaking and holding their peace, waking and sleeping, rowing and riding, laughing and weeping, in house and in field, on water and on land, and in all places. They were to be accursed in all their parts, from the sole of their feet to the crown of their head; but there was a proviso added: they were to be thus accursed unless they bethought themselves and came to satisfaction; in other words, unless they enriched the clergy and the Church.

SECTION II.

The beginning of the fourteenth century was marked by the prosecution of the brave Knights Templars, and the destruction of their order, in which the Church took an infamous part. At first, Pope Clement V. professed displeasure at the proceedings of Philip the Fair, king of France, against them; but allured by a prospect of sharing in their spoils, he soon joined the crusade against these renowned Crusaders. Bulls were addressed by him to all parts of Christendom in order to animate both princes and prelates against them. At the commencement of the reign of Edward of Caernarvon, the disgraced primate, Robert Winchelsea, was restored to his archbishopric, and having received one of these bulls, he held a provincial synod at London, A.D. 1309, in which the affair of the Templars in England was debated. A great mass of evidence was laid before this council, upon the force of which the following sentence was pronounced:—"That the Templars in London should be separated from one another, and examined again concerning the crimes objected to them; and that new interrogatories should be put to them, that if possible some truth might be extracted from them by their own con-

fessions; that the same thing should be done to the Templars confined at Lincoln; that if by these separations and interrogatories they confessed nothing more than they had done before, they should be then put to the rack, but without mutilation or the too violent shedding of blood." Commissioners were appointed to carry this sentence into execution; and at a second synod, held A.D. 1311, it is said that the Templars confessed that they had been accused of so many articles of heresy that they could not legally exculpate themselves, and that, therefore, they prayed for the mercy of God and the Church, and were ready to perform any penance which should be enjoined upon them. But all this was mere mockery. Their fate was foredoomed. The synod decreed that they should be separated from one another, and sent to the different monasteries of England to perform the penances—which meant death—until the holy see in a general council should finally determine the fate of their persons and their order. That fate was decided at a council held at Vienne, in Dauphiny, in May, A.D. 1312. The brave Knights Templars were deprived of their rich possessions, and, as seen in the history of the reign of Edward of Caernarvon, suffered martyrdom. Never was the Church guilty of a more flagrant crime than this. Clement himself seems to have been convinced of its injustice, for in his bull of condemnation, he declared that though it could not be done according to the usual rules and forms of justice, yet he "dissolved the order of the Templars by the plenitude of his power." That these brave defenders of Christianity for two centuries should have been condemned on a charge of heresy, is one of the most curious circumstances recorded in the annals of the world. That from their great wealth they might have become dissolute in their manners is probable; that they were heretics and faithless to the principles of their order is incredible.

Edward I. and his barons in Parliament assembled ad complained of the tyranny and exactions of the hurch; in the reign of his successor, the Church ifted up its voice against the tyranny and oppressions f the state. This was, in truth, a complaint which ated from the reign of William the Conqueror, who parated the ecclesiastical from the civil jurisdiction. here had been disputes without end between the cclesiastical and civil courts about the limits of their uthority; but no approach had been made towards ne final adjustment of the question. The first dward was not a monarch to give way to the hurch, but the Church hoped to find his son and ccessor more favourable to its views. In the synod f London, A.D. 1311, loud complaints were made of ne encroachments of the civil courts, and a long list f grievances was drawn up and presented to the ing in parliament, with an earnest prayer for redress. hat prayer was disregarded. By the advice of his arons, Edward made an evasive reply; but the lergy were still resolved to obtain the redress for hich they prayed. In the year 1313, the rimate, Winchelsea, who had battled earnestly for he immunities of the Church, at the cost of his peace nd comfort, died; and Clement V., in the plenitude f his apostolic power, raised Walter Reynolds, bishop f Winchester, to the primacy, and invested him, by his bulls, with powers hitherto unknown in the English Church. It was during the primacy of Reynolds that a statute was made, called *articule cleri*,

NAVE, WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

for terminating the disputes between the temporal and spiritual courts. At this time, A.D. 1316, Edward of Caernarvon stood in need of the assistance of the clergy, and, as may be supposed, the statute was all in their favour. By it, indeed, the clergy obtained that which they had long sought—exemption from civil authority. Thus, a few years after, when Adam de Orleton, who had appeared in arms with the rebellious barons defeated at Boroughbridge, was accused of high treason before the house of peers in a parliament which met at Westminster, he pleaded his privilege as a clerk,-not to be tried by laymen, and his plea was admitted. Edward subsequently attempted to bring him to a trial in the Court of King's Bench for the same crime: but the archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin came into court with their crosses before them, and carried him from the bar in triumph. Orleton soon after completed his treasonable practices by joining with the queen and Mortimer in accomplishing the destruction of Edward of Caernarvon. The favour which this monarch showed towards the Church was one of the causes

which led to his deposition, for one of the charges laid against him was that he had given allowance to the bulls of the see of Rome.

In the early part of the reign of Edward III. the most remarkable incident is the famous quarrel which occurred between that monarch and archbishop Stratford, who, through his influence, had been translated from the see of Winchester to the primacy. This quarrel has been related in a previous page, the circumstances belonging rather to civil than ecclesiastical history. As the Pope still continued to encroach upon the rights of the crown and of other patrons, by reservations and provisions, Edward addressed an emphatic remonstrance to the pontiff against these practices, but his remonstrance was unheeded. Edward had been requested by his parliament to put a stop to them by some speedy and effectual remedy; but his wars with France and Scotland so much engrossed his attention, that it was some years before any step was taken to prevent the encroachments of the court of Rome. At the death of archbishop Stratford, indeed, Edward weakened the effect of his remonstrance by the part he took in the election of his successor. The canons elected Thomas Bradwardine to be their archbishop, against which the king appealed to Rome, entreating the Pope to raise Ufford, dean of Lincoln, to the primacy, by way of provision. Ufford was promoted to the see of Canterbury; but he died without having received consecration: and then, A.D. 1349, Bradwardine, with the consent of Edward, became primate. He was consecrated at Avignon; but on the seventh day after his return to England, he died at Lambeth, and Simon Islep, keeper of the privy seal, was raised to the see of Canterbury.

Islep was a strict disciplinarian in spirituals, and a rigid exactor of the temporal emoluments of his see. In his primary visitation several of his clergy were deprived for their irregularities, and some of his suffragans trembled for their fate. His strictness of discipline was also seen in the constitutions published by him during his primacy. The king and the barons had justly complained that when a clerk had been condemned to perpetual imprisonment by his ordinary, he was either allowed to escape or to live in luxury in the bishop's prison. By one of his constitutions, Islep decreed that such culprits should only be allowed bread and water for three days in the week, bread and beer for three days, and on Sundays, for "the honour of the day," the rare luxury of bread, beer, and pulse. By other constitutions the people were forbidden to hold fairs and markets on the sabbath, and commanded not only to go to church on that day, but to keep all the saints' days with great devotion. It was during this primacy that the great plague, before recorded, raged in England. This pestilence swept away great numbers of the clergy. Before it, Knyghton says, a curate might have been hired for four or five marks a year, or for two marks and his board, but after it there could hardly be found a clergyman who would accept a vicarage of twenty marks or twenty pounds a year. It seems singular that Islep, who is represented as a rigid exactor of his own emoluments, should, under such circumstances, publish a constitution in which he reproached the clergy for their covetousness, and forbade any rector to give, or curate to demand, more than one mark a year above what had been given before the plague, yet such a canon exists among the constitutions he promulgated.

While the primate was thus providing for the discipline of the Church, Edward III. and his barons were engaged in an attempt to check the encroachments of the court of Rome upon the rights of the crown, and of private patrons. By a statute made A.D. 1353, it was enacted: "That if any person shall procure reservations or provisions from the Pope, in disturbance of free elections, or of the presentees of the king, or other patrons, that then the said provisors, their procurators and notaries, shall be apprehended and brought to answer; and in case they are convicted, they shall be kept in prison till they have made fine and ransom to the king at his will, and have satisfied the party aggrieved by paying his damages." As the frequent appeals to the court of Rome was, if possible, a still more vexatious and expensive grievance than papal provisions and reservations, another statute at this period enacted:—"That all people of the king's legiance who shall draw any out of the realm in a plea whereby the cognizance pertains to the king's court, or of things whereof judgments are given in the king's court, shall have two months' warning given them to appear in the king's courts to answer the contempt; and if they do not appear in their proper persons, to be at the law within the time appointed, they, their procurators, &c., shall from that day forth be put out of the king's protection, and their lands, goods, and chattels shall be forfeited to the king, and their bodies imprisoned and ransomed at the king's will."

No statutes, however, could at this period check the encroachments of the court of Rome. The Pope seems to have taken a pride in displaying his contempt of the laws made in England to curb his power. In the year 1360 a plague caused vacancies in seven English bishoprics, all of which were filled with papal nominees; and when the primate, Islep, died, A.D. 1366, although the monks of Canterbury chose Ednydon, bishop of Winchester, to be archbishop, their election was repudiated by the Pope, who granted a provision to Langham, bishop of Ely, to fill that high station; and again, when Langham, two years after, resigned his archbishopric, another papal provision promoted Wittlesey, bishop of London, to the primacy. The sovereign pontiff, indeed, continued to bestow the richest benefices of the kingdom upon foreigners by his provisions, as if no laws existed against his encroachments. In the year 1374 the king sent writs to all the bishops, requiring them to send certificates into chancery of all the benefices in their respective dioceses that were in the possession of Italians and other foreigners. It might have been expected that such certificates were required for the purposes of reformation in the Church as regards the bestowal of benefices on aliens. Edward, however, after all proved himself to be but a temporizing reformer. He enacted statutes, and then by his own subserviency to the court of Rome, set aside their effects. The primate, Wittlesey, died A.D. 1374, and the monks of Canterbury re-elected their former arch-

, now Cardinal Langham, who resided at on; but Edward, offended at their choice, again d to the Pope, who, at his request, translated Sudbury, bishop of London, to the primacy. ommons of England in parliament were more us of a reformation in matters relating to the h than the king, for in the year 1376 they ited a strong remonstrance to him against the rable exactions of the court of Rome, in which ffirmed that the taxes paid yearly to the Pope gland, amounted to five times as much as the he received for the support of his crown.

his time the avarice and tyranny of the court ne, and the power of the clergy, were attracting eal attention. There was a general feeling that the Church dignitaries and the religious were more intent upon their own aggrandise- and the gratification of their own luxury, than holding of the faith and duties of the gospel. was rising out of the darkness which had so vershadowed the land. A great reformer had ; up in the bosom of the Church, that illus- opponent of the papal court, the celebrated loctor, John Wycliffe.

early reformer was born at Wycliffe, near ond, Yorkshire, about A.D. 1324, and was ed at Oxford, where, after obtaining the highest ical honours, he was advanced to the professor- divinity. No better choice could have been of a professor of divinity for that famous uni- r than John Wycliffe, for, unlike the schoolmen age, he was a diligent student of the Holy ires. His theological lectures were attended by xl audiences, by whom they were received with nded applause. His doctrines were different hose of the Church at that time, for he com- the exorbitant power and ambition of the court ic, not only in temporals but in spirituals. He nced his career as an ecclesiastical reformer, 356, by writing his treatise called "The Last of the Church;" but before that time he had the seeds of the gospel broadcast among the of the university. It seems, indeed, to have o his disciples at Oxford that Chaucer alludes description of the clerk who he says was:—

"Sounder in moral virtue was his speech,
And gladly wold he learn and gladly teach."

lthough Wycliffe commenced his career as a er by lectures and treatises, it was as a priest e spread abroad his doctrines far and wide. g entered into orders, he first obtained the of Filingham, in Lincolnshire. At that time ss of the people bowed before the forms, but gnorant of the essentials of religion. The good of Filingham, therefore, must have been as- d at the new preacher that appeared among for it was the essentials and not the forms of n in which he instructed them. No doubt the e sowed among this his first flock produced but it was while he was rector of Lutterworth, estershire, that Wycliffe became celebrated as cher of the gospel. It was while he was at worth, that by his preaching and his numerous writings, he more especially attacked the strongholds of popery. In the year 1365 the Pope demanded the arrears of the tribute known as Peter's pence. Parliament refused to pay it; but no voice was more loudly lifted up against it than was that of the "parson of Lutterworth." The treatise which he published on this occasion brought him into notice at court. The great warrior, Edward III, had been unable to cope with the court of Rome, and Wycliffe was chosen by him as his champion. He was employed in several embassies to that court, and as he gained by such an employment a clearer and clearer insight into the corruptions of that court and the errors of the Church, he became more and more bold in his denunciations against them. He denounced the Pope as antichrist, denied his supremacy, and exposed his tyranny in the strongest colours. Gregory XI., who was then seated in the papal chair, if not alarmed at the boldness of the parson of Lutterworth, was enraged. Bulls were published against him in the year 1377, and he was commanded to be seized, imprisoned, and brought to trial for his heresies. But at this time Wycliffe ruled supreme in the favour of the court and the affections of the people. He was protected from imprisonment, but at the same time he was compelled to appear before Courtenay, bishop of London, who had been appointed by the Pope as his judge. It has before been recorded that he was protected on that occasion by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Lord Henry Percy, marshal of England. This was in the year 1377, the first year of the reign of Richard II., and in the same year Wycliffe made a second appearance before the Pope's commissioners at Lambeth, where he was so well protected by the citizens of London, that the judges feared to pronounce sentence against him.

Gregory XI. died in March, A.D. 1378, and for a time the prosecution of Wycliffe was suspended. There was a schism at Rome, and civil war in England. During the commotions of the English peasantry, Sudbury, the primate, lost his head on Tower Hill, and Urban VI., who was acknowledged Pope in England, promoted Courtenay, bishop of London, to the primacy. Some historians have endeavoured to connect the preaching of Wycliffe with the peasant insurrection of the reign of Richard II., but this is altogether erroneous. He was a reformer in the Church, not a sower of sedition in the state. He was a bold and undaunted opposer of the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, but he was firm in his allegiance to his sovereign. It is nowhere on record that his patriotism was ever called into question, and it is certain that he was never charged before any tribunal with plotting against the state. His prosecutions were all concerning matters of faith and doctrine. As soon as the insurrection of the commons was quelled, and the public tranquillity restored, the primate, Courtenay, applied with great zeal to the suppression of the so-called heretical opinions propagated by Wycliffe and his followers. For at this time others were engaged in the work which he had commenced. Borrowing their light from him who has been appropriately called "the rising sun of the Reformation," they travelled about the country in the simplest manner, barefoot, and in

common frieze gowns, preaching in the market-places and teaching the doctrines of truth with great zeal and much success. Wycliffe personally was protected from the malice of the Romish prelates, but some of his followers, who were derisively called Lollards—either from Walter Lollardus, one of the teachers of gospel doctrines on the Continent, or from a German word which signifies psalm-singers—were bitterly persecuted. Richard himself countenanced Courtenay, the primate, in his proceedings against them. It does not appear, however, that during this reign any were put to death, although many suffered imprisonment, and were required to do penance under the most degrading circumstances. Wycliffe himself was chiefly attacked in his writings. In May, A.D. 1382, Courtenay, the primate, assembled a council of the prelates of his province, and many doctors of divinity and of the civil and canon law, for the purpose of suppressing the doctrines he taught. Twenty-four opinions extracted from his writings were laid before this council, ten of which were adjudged to be heretical, and fourteen erroneous. But the sentence of this council was not deemed infallible by the clergy generally. There were many in the Church who had imbibed the doctrines of Wycliffe, and who secretly, if not openly, taught them to the people. The primate even found that they had many zealous advocates in the university of Oxford, for when he sent the decrees of his late council thither to be published on Corpus Christi Day, Dr. Philip Rapyngdon, who was appointed to preach on that day, vehemently declaimed against the corruptions of the Church, and warmly defended the doctrines of Wycliffe, and his sermon was applauded by many of his hearers. On the other hand, when Dr. Stokes published the decrees, he was interrupted with clamours and reproaches, and was compelled to desist without receiving any protection from the chancellor or proctors, who secretly favoured the new opinions.

Meanwhile, Wycliffe was busy in his parsonage-house at Lutterworth, with his pen. Numerous treatises were written by him; but his crowning work was the translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English language. It was this work, above all others, that gained for him the blessings of posterity, but the bitter hatred of the Romish Church. It was the most useful measure he could have devised for the instruction of the people in righteousness, but it was the very work that the Romish Church wished to be a sealed book to the people. How it was received by the ecclesiastics who were still faithful to the papacy, is thus disclosed: "Christ," says one of these ecclesiastics, "committed the gospel to the clergy and doctors of the Church, that they might administer it to the laity and weaker persons, according as the times and people's wants might require; but this Master John Wycliffe translated it out of Latin into English, and by that means laid it more open to the laity, and to women who could read, than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy, and those of them who had the best understanding. And so the gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden under swine; and that which used to be precious to both clergy and laity, is made, as it were, the common jest of both, and the jewel of the Church is turned into the sport of the laity."

LUTTERWORTH CHURCH.

In what light Wycliffe was held by the Romish Church, was seen at his death more than during his life. He was in his parish church at Lutterworth, performing service, when the hand of death was laid upon him. He was struck with palsy on the 28th of December, A.D. 1384, and he expired on the last day of that year. There were great rejoicings at that event. The manner in which he died was ascribed to the immediate vengeance of heaven for his heresy. Walsingham says, "That limb of the devil, enemy of the Church, deceiver of the people, idol of heretics, mirror of hypocrites, author of schism, sower of hatred, and inventor of lies, John Wycliffe, was, by the immediate judgment of God, suddenly struck with a palsy which seized all the members of his body when he was ready to vomit forth his blasphemies in a sermon which he had prepared to preach that day." But the rejoicings of the Romish Church were premature. Wycliffe was greater in death than he had been in life. He had left writings behind him which did more for the Reformation than all his lectures at Oxford, or his sermons at Lutterworth parish church had effected. Knyghton says that more than one-half of the people of England became his followers, and embraced his doctrines. The "good Queen Anne" adopted them; and some of her Bohemian attendants, on returning to the Continent, introduced his writings to their countrymen. The celebrated John Huss read them with profit, and laboured to circulate the pure knowledge of the gospel as taught by Wycliffe, till a martyrdom through treachery terminated his career. How bitterly the memory of this "morning-star of the Reformation" was hated by the papal power, was seen in many a vain attempt to blot it from the page of history. His doctrines were condemned by many councils after his death, and his works were burnt wherever they could be found. At Prague, in Bohemia, more than two hundred volumes were thus destroyed by Subynes, the archbishop, and about the same time a great number were committed to the flames by a decree of the university, and under the inspection of the chancellor. But all these attempts to destroy the works of

were ineffectual, for some of his writings are
ant, testifying to the purity of his doctrines
bold intrepidity in defying a power which
a supposed would never die. Thirty years
i death, by the direction of the council of
e, the bones of "the evil parson of Lutter-
were exhumed, burned, and cast into the
small adjoining stream. "This brook," says
at Thomas Fuller, "hath conveyed his ashes
n, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow
y into the main ocean; and thus the ashes of
are the emblem of his doctrine, which is now
l all the world over."

thstanding the various statutes made to limit
pations of the court of Rome, they rather in-
than diminished. The battle, therefore, be-
e civil and the ecclesiastical power still con-

In the reign of Richard II. it was enacted
lien should be presented to any ecclesiastical
nt, and that all liegemen of the king accept-
ny living by any foreign provision, should
eir lands and goods, and be banished from
m, and the benefice made void. It was
provided that any person bringing over any
or excommunication from Rome on account of
ution of the statutes made in the present or
eigns, should "be taken, arrested, and put in
nd forfeit all his lands and tenements, goods
tels, for ever, and incur the pains of life and
er." But the crowning act of all, and that
h the civil power finally triumphed over the
Rome, was the famous statute passed in 1392,
e "Statute of Præmunire." By that statute
rdained and established that any person who
or brought into the kingdom, either from
elsewhere, any provisions, excommunications,
other instruments, against the rights and
of the crown, should be put out of the king's
n, forfeit all his lands and goods, and if
rought before the king and his council to
or his offence. After this severe statute was
the popes prolonged the struggle for some
They continued to present, as before, to all
benefices the incumbents of which had died
, but as the king and his parliament would
r these presentations in any instance to have
ey finally yielded, and henceforth they only
l presentations and provisions in favour of
eviously nominated by the crown.

raged by the contest between the king and
nt and the court of Rome, the Lollards boldly
the established church. In the year 1394
strance was presented by them to parliament,
ng twelve articles of complaint against the
and clergy, praying for redress and reforma-
The Lollards particularly complained of the
ealth, and profligate lives of the clergy; of
tantiation and the superstitious practices to
led; and of prayers for the dead, the wor-
ship of images, of pilgrimages, and of the evil consequences of auricular confession. This remonstrance had no effect, but at the same time many of the barons were Lollards at heart. So bold had the Lollards become at this time in their opposition to the Romish Church, that they published stinging satires on the clergy, some of which were posted up on the most public places in London and Westminster. Richard was at that time in Ireland, and alarmed at these bold attacks, the clergy sent commissioners to entreat him to return immediately to defend the Church; and, says Walsingham, when he heard the representations made by the commissioners, "being inspired with the Divine Spirit, he hastened into England, thinking it more necessary to defend the Church than to conquer kingdoms." On his return, several barons who had favoured the Lollards were summoned before him, and threatened with death if they gave any further encouragement to them, and, intimidated by these threats, they withdrew their protection. It is said that some of the Lollard preachers, having thus lost their patrons, recanted, and returned into the bosom of the Church; but these must have been isolated instances; for Arundel, who succeeded to the primacy on the death of Courtenay, A.D. 1396, designed to employ against them all the additional power he had acquired by his promotion, a proof that the Church still looked upon them as powerful adversaries. But Arundel had no opportunity of putting his design into execution. He was one of that party who, in the same year he was raised to the primacy, obtained a commission from parliament investing them with the whole power of the state; for which, as before related, he was subsequently found guilty of high treason, deprived, and banished. After his departure, Roger Walden, treasurer of England, was consecrated primate, A.D. 1398, but by the revolution of the next year, by which Richard was deposed, he was deprived, and Arundel returned from his exile, and was restored to his dignity; and, as will be seen in the next period, he then executed the design he had formed of persecuting the Lollards even unto death.

Concerning the history of the Church of Scotland very little is known, and that little consists of dry details, which would be uninteresting to the reader. It may be mentioned, however, that there were in this period twelve bishoprics in Scotland, besides that of St. Andrew's; namely, those of Glasgow, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Moray, Brechin, Dunblane, Ross, Caithness, Orkney, Galloway, Argyle, and the Isles. The constitution and the doctrines of the Church of Scotland appear to have remained unchanged. Even the famous doctrines of Wycliffe were either unknown or disregarded in Scotland, for no mention is made of them beyond the borders, a circumstance which may be attributed to the frequent wars and violent animosities existing between the two kingdoms.

CHAPTER IV

The History of Literature, Science, and Art, from A.D. 1216 to A.D. 1399

THE revival of elegant literature in the twelfth century, as recorded in a previous page, was of an evanescent character. It was a spring without a summer, a bud of promise nipped by a wintry blast of cold neglect. The passion for elegant studies was swallowed up in an all-absorbing rage for metaphysical disputation. The preceding period had been remarkable for the production of elegant Latin poets, but almost the only writer of this class in the present age was William the Breton, who wrote an epic on the actions of Philip Augustus. The very study of the ancient classics was neglected; and the result was that the habit of speaking Latin correctly and elegantly, which had been a characteristic of the scholars who flourished in the Norman period, was now generally lost. The classic tongue became corrupted into a base jargon, in which both grammar and syntax were disregarded. So barbarous and ungrammatical was the Latin taught even in the celebrated seat of learning at Oxford, that two successive archbishops of Canterbury, in the years 1276 and 1284, pronounced sentences of condemnation against various phrases which were not only commonly used in that university, but defended by its teachers and students. As for Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, there were but few who studied those languages, and those who did were looked upon as magicians, who made themselves acquainted with them in order to converse with the devil.

But though elegant literature languished in this era, it must not be supposed that learning and education made no progress. On the contrary, there was something like a universal diffusion of education and knowledge, not only in England, but on the Continent. In the beginning of the fourteenth century there were thirty thousand students at Oxford alone; and the university of Paris very probably could have boasted of a much larger number. Everywhere there was great intellectual activity. Enthusiasm for the crusades was succeeded by an enthusiasm for study. Such a busy age for teachers perhaps had never been known before, either in England or on the Continent. Learning everywhere had its numerous devotees; but it was of an essentially different character to the old mode of mental culture. Scarcely any other branch of learning was cultivated by the numerous students in the colleges of England and the Continent than the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. The logic of the period was the art of disputing without end and without meaning, of perplexing great truths, and making absurdities plausible. "That two contradictory propositions might be true," was, for instance, often as hotly disputed as if the lives of the disputants depended on the issue of the debate. The disputants, indeed, of such like frivolous arguments often proceeded from angry words to blows, and raised dangerous riots in the halls of learning. And as the logic of the period was quibbling and useless, so was the metaphysics. Instead of investigating the laws of nature and the properties of things, by sagacious and well-conducted experiments, the natural philosophers of the period spent their time in inventing abstract questions, on which they disputed and wrote with marvellous subtlety, but to no useful purpose. Some of their tenets, such as, "That in a man there is only one form," appeared so dangerous to Archbishop Peckham, that at the same time he pronounced sentence against the bad Latin taught at Oxford, he condemned them with much solemnity, and subjected those who taught them to severe penalties. But the evil was not easily remedied. In some of the most famous universities students were called upon to take a solemn oath to defend the opinions of Aristotle; and the result of such a system could not but be adverse to the progress of sound knowledge. All that the mass of students in the universities derived from their studies was, therefore, a knowledge of bad Latin and worse logic.

In the mathematical and physical sciences, however, there are some great names to be found in this period. Among these are the names of Roger Bacon, Robert Grostête, bishop of Lincoln, and Sir Michael Scott. The greatest name of the thirteenth century, and for some centuries to come, is that of Roger Bacon, who was born at Ilchester about A.D. 1214, and died A.D. 1292. The writings of this truly profound philosopher are still preserved; and they show that his investigations included theology, grammar, the ancient languages, geometry, astronomy, chronology, geography, music, optics, mechanics, chemistry, and most of the other branches of experimental philosophy. Among the discoveries of this great man is that of the exact length of the solar year, and the method of correcting all the errors in the calendar. He also discovered the art of making reading-glasses, the camera-obscura, microscopes, telescopes, and various other mathematical and astronomical instruments. To him, likewise, is attributed the discovery of the art of making gunpowder, elixirs, tinctures, and solutions, and of performing many of the chemical operations in modern use. More discoveries were made by Friar Bacon than were ever made by one man in an equal space of time; and taking into consideration the ignorance of the age in which he lived, they must be pronounced marvellous. So marvellous were they considered by the monks of his order, that they believed, or pretended to believe, that he was a magician, and held intercourse with infernal spirits, and he was put in close confinement, in which he languished for many years, and was

finally released about three years before he died. truly was a pursuit of knowledge under diffi- es. Bacon's notions on the right method of osophizing are remarkably enlightened for his and his general views upon most subjects evince metration and liberality far in advance of his s; but with all this he was a firm believer in logy and alchemy, which may have been one of primary causes of the persecutions he was called to endure. At the same time those delusions not stand in the same predicament as they do at present day, when few but the really ignorant any faith in them. They were then "irrational because unproved, and neither impossible nor orthy of the investigation of a philosopher, in absence of preceding experiments." Grostête, or sthead, bishop of Lincoln, was the friend and on of the great philosopher, Bacon. He appears ave been born of poor parents, at Stow, in Lin- shire, so poor that he was reduced to the meanest es, and even in early life to beg his bread. He d a patron in the mayor of Lincoln, who sent him hool, and, aided by other patrons, he afterwards

FRIAR BACON'S STUDY.

cuted his studies at Cambridge, Oxford, and . He became one of the best and most uni- l scholars of his age, well versed not only in the ch and Latin, but in the Greek and Hebrew ages. Bacon says that he spent much of his during forty years in the study of every branch e mathematics in which he excelled. He be- bishop of Lincoln in the year 1235; in which n he became famous for a holy life, the popu- r of his preaching, the vigour of his discipline, he boldness with which he reproved the vices, opposed the haughty mandates of the court of . In his latter days he denounced Pope Inno- IV. as Antichrist; and although Innocent was ous of crushing his bold reprover, he was afraid oceeding against him. Greathead died A.D. 1253, ng a number of treatises on a great variety of subjects, both in divinity and philosophy, of great value, to enlighten posterity. Sir Michael Scott was a contemporary of Bacon and the good bishop of Lincoln, being born at Balwirie, in Fife, about the beginning of the thirteenth century, and dying A.D. 1290. Like Bacon, he was addicted to the study of alchemy and astrology; but these were considered by him to be only parts of natural philosophy. Scott is said to have been skilled both in astronomy and medicine; and among other works attributed to him are, a treatise on physiognomy, and a history of animals.

These three instances of men of great learning in the mathematical and physical sciences are rare exceptions to the general rule at this period. According to Bacon, few students of the age proceeded further in the science of mathematics than the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid, a proposition popularly called "the asses' bridge"—so absorbed were the masses in the futile study of metaphysics and logic. Arithmetic, also, although the knowledge of the Arabic numerals had found its way to Europe within this period, was not a study of the age. In astronomy, however, advances must have been made, for some of the members of the university of Paris correctly predicted an eclipse of the sun which occurred on the 31st of January, A.D. 1310. This science owes much of the attention paid to it to that of astrology, which taught that the affairs of mankind were influenced by the stars. In like manner, the imaginary science of alchemy led to the progress of chemistry and medicine Besides Bacon and Scott, other writers on alchemy of this period are, John Daustein, Richard, and Cremer, abbot of Westminster. But the most famous was one Raymond Lully, a foreigner, who visited England by the invitation of Edward I., for whom he is said to have transmuted in his presence some crystal into a mass of diamonds, of which Edward caused some little pillars to be made for the tabernacle of God. The kings of this period appear to have been firm believers in alchemy, for Edward III., hearing that John of Rous and William of Dalby knew how to make silver by that art, and did make it for their own use, commissioned one Thomas Cary to apprehend them with all the instruments of their art, in order that they might for the future make the precious metal for the benefit of himself and his kingdom. The two principal writers on medicine in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were Gilbert English and John de Gaddesden; but although they possessed the knowledge of some useful remedies, the art as taught by them, and practised by the medical profession—for it *was* now a distinct profession—was still a mixture of superstition and quackery as when the healing art was in the hands of the clergy. The medical profession appears to have been divided into three branches, as at the present day, the physician, apothecary, and surgeon; for that surgery began to be followed as a separate branch, is proved by works still extant, written by John Arden, a surgeon who practised in the fourteenth century at Newark. As regards geography, some new information was obtained in this era, of the locality, institutions, customs, and general state of distant countries, from the accounts published

by several travellers; particularly by Marco Polo, who, towards the end of the thirteenth century, sailed as far as Tartary and China; and by Sir John Mandeville, who, about a century later, visited a great part of the East. An epitome of the geographical knowledge of his time is inserted in Friar Bacon's great work, entitled "Opus Majus."

In divinity the three most famous writers of this period were, John Duns Scotus, William Ockham, and John Wycliffe, the two former of whom belonged to a numerous class of divines called "schoolmen," and the latter, as before noticed, to a despised class who studied the Scriptures diligently, and were called in derision, "Bible doctors."

Duns Scotus was so famous for his genius and learning, that England, Scotland, and Ireland have contended for the honour of his birth. His birthplace appears to have been Duns, in Berwickshire; and the date of his birth about A.D. 1265. His early education was obtained at Newcastle, in a Franciscan monastery; but he afterwards prosecuted his studies at Merton College, in Oxford. He became so celebrated for his knowledge of the civil and canon law, and his skill in school divinity, that in the year 1301 he was advanced to the theological chair in that university. The lectures delivered by him in that capacity obtained a world-wide celebrity; especially those of a controversial character on the writings of Peter Lombard. From Oxford, Duns Scotus went to Paris, where he defended the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, impugned by the divines of that city, with such success that the university of Paris bestowed on him the title of "The Subtile Doctor," as a reward for his victory. Subsequently he defended the same doctrine at Cologne, against the disciples of Albert the Great. He was sent to Cologne by Gonsalvo, the general of the Franciscan order, to found a university in that city similar to that of Paris; but he died soon after his arrival, in the forty-fourth year of his age. Few men ever possessed a more fertile invention, a more acute and penetrating genius, or a more unremitting application to study than Duns Scotus; but unfortunately for his fame and for the world, his talents were wasted on the subtleties of school philosophy, and the absurdities of school divinity, and hence his writings, which were numerous, are now consigned to dust and neglect.

William Ockham was one of the most distinguished disciples of John Duns Scotus, and the founder of a sect of schoolmen called Ockhamists. He was born at Ockham, in Surrey, about A.D. 1280, and pursued his studies at Oxford and Paris, under his great master. But he did not yield an implicit faith to the doctrines taught by Scotus; on the contrary, he impugned some of his opinions with so much success that he obtained many followers, who were thence denominated Ockhamists. But Ockham rendered himself more famous for his opposition to the heretical principles and ambitious pretensions of Pope John, than for his school divinity. Ockham belonged to the order of St. Francis, and having in the year 1322, in a general assembly of the Franciscans, boldly defended the principles of that section of the order called "Spiritual brethren," which Pope John had condemned as heretical; and having impugned the pontiff's favourite doctrine, that the souls of good men were not admitted to the vision of God and the happiness of heaven till after the resurrection, he was excommunicated. While in retirement he composed several of his works, particularly his compendium of the heresies of Pope John. At this period Louis of Bavaria, emperor of Germany, was under the ban of excommunication, and Ockham, in A.D. 1328, repaired to his court, where he published several treatises in defence of his royal protector, constantly maintaining —in opposition to the favourite maxim of the papal court, "that all emperors, kings, and princes are subject to the authority of the Pope in all things"— that the emperor was subject to none but God in temporals. So long as his protector Louis lived, Ockham smiled at the rage of Pope John and his successors, Benedict XIV. and Clement VI; but after his death he was compelled to become reconciled to the Church under the most humiliating circumstances. He obtained absolution from Clement upon condition of renouncing all his former heresies, and swearing submission to every papal decision and mandate for the future. The "invincible doctor," as he was called, was conquered; but he did not long survive his abjuration of opinions he had so long and so ardently sought to establish: he died at Capua, in Italy, A.D. 1356.

The historians of this age are very numerous. The most eminent of the thirteenth century is Matthew Paris, who was a Benedictine monk in the abbey of St. Albans. His principal work, entitled "Historia Major," or, "The Greater History," commences at the Norman Conquest, and comes down to the year in which he died, namely, A.D. 1259. He was much employed in affairs of state during the reign of Henry III., with whom he appears to have been a favourite. Some portions of his history were written while he was at court, for he intimates that he was almost constantly with the king, in his palace, at his table, or in his closet, and that Henry "guided his pen in writing, in the most diligent and condescending manner." But though a courtier and a favourite, Matthew Paris was no flatterer of the king, or those who were in power. On the contrary, he censures without ceremony, and in the plainest language, their vices and follies. There is no contemporary writer of history who can be compared with him for intrepidity. Thus we have his own testimony that when Henry III. granted by charter to one of his courtiers the liberty of hunting in the lands belonging to the abbey of St. Albans, which was a direct invasion of the privileges granted by former charters to that abbey, he went boldly to the king, and reproached him for his injustice; and that the king excused himself on the ground that he had only imitated the Pope, who, by the famous clause of *Non Obstante*, in his bulls, daily revoked the privileges he had granted, and bestowed them upon others. Nor was Matthew Paris more obsequious to the court of Rome than he was to his sovereign. It was a rare circumstance in that century for any one who was a member of the Church to unveil its ambitious designs; but Matthew Paris, though a monk, expresses himself with the most extraordinary freedom in regard to the usurpa-

ions of the court of Rome, whence his work has always been bitterly decried by the Catholics. At the present day, Dr. Lingard has denounced it as a "romance rather than history;" and a fruitless attempt has been made to prove that much of its text is the interpolation of Protestant editors. After his death the "Historia Major" was continued to the close of the reign of Henry III. by William Risanger, who appears to have been his successor in the office of historiographer in the abbey of St. Albans. Other chroniclers of this period are, Thomas Wykes, canon regular of Osney, near Oxford, whose chronicle extends from the Conquest to A.D. 1304; Walter Hemingford, a monk in the abbey of Gisborough, in Yorkshire, who wrote a valuable history from the Conquest to A.D. 1347; Robert de Avesbury, register of the archbishop of Canterbury's court, who composed a history of the reign of Edward III. to the year A.D. 1356; Nicholas Trivet, a Dominican friar of London, who was the author of "Historical Annals," from A.D. 1130 to A.D. 1307; Henry Knyghton, a canon of Leicester, who compiled a history from the time of Edgar to A.D. 1395, and an account of the deposition of Richard II.; and Ralph Higden, a monk of St. Westbury, in Chester, whose "Polychronicon," which ends A.D. 1357, was before the close of this period translated into English by a Cornish divine named John de Trevisa. Besides these histories there were various others of less note, and monastic registers of less value. Among these may be mentioned Matthew of Westminster's "Flowers of History," comprehending the period from the creation of the world to the conquest of England, a work said to have been an almost exact transcript of an unpublished work written by Matthew Paris. Other historians were, John de Fordun, a Scotch chronicler, Thomas Stubbs, William Thorn, and Adam de Meriathe.

Throughout this period, although the elegancies of the Latin tongue were neglected, it still continued to be the language of the learned both in England and the Continent. It was that in which epistolary intercourse was chiefly carried on, and in which books on all subjects were generally written. It was used by scholastic divines, philosophers, and historians; by writers on geometry, astronomy, chemistry, medicine, and other branches of mathematical and natural science. French, however, which was the language of the court and nobility of England from the period of the Conquest, was occasionally employed in literary composition. In the early part of this period the language of the law was Latin, at first in writing, but towards the close of the reign of Edward I. the French language was sometimes employed. The French was more frequently used in the reign of Edward II.; and in the two succeeding reigns it became almost the only language in which the statutes were written. Law treatises, also, were at the close of this period sometimes written in Latin and sometimes in French. The French language was the common medium of discourse at court and among the nobility, and, indeed, of every one who wished to be thought persons of rank and fashion. "Gentlemen's children," writes the author of the "Polychronicon," "be learned and taught from their youth to speak French;" adding, "and uplandish men will counterfeit and liken themselves to gentlemen, and are busy to speak French for to be more set by; wherefore it is said by common proverb, 'Jack would be a gentleman if he could speak French.'"

No doubt there were some who coveted a knowledge of that language, that they might be considered "gentlemen," but the great body of the people steadily adhered to the language of their Teutonic ancestors, the Anglo-Saxon, or the English. All the efforts of the Conqueror and his successors to uproot it by the Norman, or French, signally failed. It even gradually gained ground, and in the course of this period it found its way into the courts of justice. By an act passed in parliament, A.D. 1362, it was ordained that all pleadings in courts "both of the king and of inferior lords, should be in the English tongue, because French was now much unknown in the realm, and that the people might know something of the laws, and understand what was said for and against them." But the truth is, the French language never had made any progress towards becoming the vernacular language of this country; and this act is only another proof of the growing intelligence and power of the people. It was clearly a concession made to the popular demand. It was also a proof that the French language was giving way to the vernacular tongue, even amongst "gentlemen." The translator of the "Polychronicon" bears testimony to this fact, for he states that at the time of his translation, A.D. 1385, gentlemen "had much left off to have their children taught French;" and it has been seen that at the meeting of Richard II. and his cousin, Henry of Bolingbroke, their mutual greetings were exchanged in the English language, which the French knight who recorded it declared he "understood very well."

But although French neither supplanted the Saxon language, nor acquired the predominance in the mixture or fluctuation of the two languages, it infused itself largely into the vocabulary of the national tongue. For two hundred years after the Conquest, the Anglo-Saxon language was remarkably pure, with very little mixture of French, Latin, or any other language; but in the course of the fourteenth century it gradually changed into what may be called English; that is, while the rest of the language still continued essentially Saxon, many words and idioms were introduced into it, not only from the French, but from the Greek and the Italian languages. At the same time it must not be supposed that the English of the fourteenth century was the same pure language employed in conversation and in the writings of the present day. It was essentially different. Few English readers, indeed, could now understand it without a glossary. At that period the orthography was in an unsettled state; there was a superfluity of vowels and a paucity of consonants; and, above all, many words then in common use and well understood, are become obsolete, while others had a different meaning now attached to them. Thus the word "knave," for instance, which now signifies "a petty rascal," or "scoundrel," then sometimes signified a male in opposition to a female child, but most frequently a servant in opposition to a

freeman. Then, again, the poets of the period, who may be considered the true founders of English literature, used considerable freedom in shortening, lengthening, dividing, uniting, and changing words, to fit them for their own purposes, which renders it difficult to understand their language. Yet, with all these obscurities, it was in the fourteenth century that the foundations of pure English literature were laid; and to no one is posterity more indebted for laying those foundations than Laurence Minot, William Langland, John Gower, and last and greatest of all, Geoffrey Chaucer.

Laurence Minot flourished in the reign of Edward III.; and his chief writings are a series of poetical pieces on the warlike achievements of that monarch. So spirited are his verses that Campbell styles him "the Tyrtæus of the age."

It was also in the reign of Edward III. that William Langland wrote a singular poem entitled, "The Visions of [that is, concerning] Pierce Plowman," a poem written in a diction of fashion and versification, which appears to have been intended as imitations of a Saxon model. Langland adopts no new words or forms of expression in *his* poetry, his object being evidently the revival of those that had become, or were becoming, obsolete. In Langland's satires, the abstract doctrines of the Lollards are enforced. His poetry, in which there is great vigour and animation displayed, is like the old Saxon poetry, written in the alliterative style.



GOWER'S MONUMENT.

John Gower was a student in the Inner Temple, and was the author of much English as well as Latin and French verse. He was one of the most admired poets of the fourteenth century, but his verse is more moral than poetical. His chief work, "Confessio Amantis," which was written at the desire of Richard II., is a poetical system of morality, whence his friend Chaucer designated him "moral Gower." Gower died A.D. 1402, and was buried in the conventual church of St. Mary Overies, in Southwark, which he rebuilt chiefly at his own expense. A beautiful monument to his memory still exists in that church, the poet being represented in effigy, with his head resting on three gilded volumes of his writings, one of which is the "Confessio Amantis."

Geoffrey Chaucer is the true father of our English literature. Compared with his writings, all that precedes it is barbarism. He was born in London about A.D. 1328, and was educated at Cambridge and Oxford. Like his friend Gower, he was a student of law, but having a distaste for it, he became a courtier. He was page to Edward III. when that king was in the zenith of his prosperity, and his court in its highest splendour. Having, however, married a sister of the famous Lady Catherine Swynford, then the mistress, and afterwards the wife of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, he subsequently engaged in the political intrigues of that prince, by which his connection with the court became severed. With Lancaster he warmly espoused the cause of Wycliffe, a mortal offence in the eyes of the court and the clergy. He fled to the Continent, where he resided for several years, and when compelled, through poverty, to return to England, he was apprehended and thrown into prison. Set at liberty by revealing the secrets of his party, he afterwards retired to Woodstock, where he wrote his celebrated "Testament of Love." In later years, when his friend and patron, John of Gaunt, had recovered his influence at court, Chaucer was favoured with several grants from the crown, and he lived in ease and plenty at Donnington Castle, near Newbury. His death, however, took place in London, A.D. 1400.

As a poet, Chaucer is the most illustrious of all that appeared before him, and for two hundred years there was no minstrel to be compared to him. In that early morn of the English language he produced compositions unrivalled for elegance and true poetical merit, for a long series of years. To Chaucer, indeed, is owing not only the foundations of the English language, but the peculiar and characteristic spirit which adorns the whole structure of English poetry. His verse displays a rich combination of contrasted elegancies. There is in it all the various qualities of a mighty genius, such as can scarcely be found in any other English poet except Shakespeare. His crowning work is his "Canterbury Tales," which exhibits almost every variety of gay and serious poetry, and in which his genius revels in all the distinctive features of his art with a luxuriance of strength truly marvellous, the more so because Chaucer appeared with all the lustre and dignity of a poet, in an age which compelled him to struggle with a barbarous language and a national want of taste, and when to write verse at all was a singular qualification. It was an age

when thick darkness covered our island, and gross darkness the people. It was the age of popery, the genius of which was, and is, and ever will be, incompatible with the divine art of poetry.

This period witnessed the birth of Scottish poetry. John Barbour, archdeacon of Aberdeen, wrote a poem entitled, "Bruce," in which he immortalizes the exploits of that heroic prince and his brave companions in arms, Randolph, earl of Moray, and the Lord James Douglas, in verse which displays considerable merit. Andrew Wynton, also, prior of Lochleven, wrote a "Cronykil" in verse; but beyond these two works, there were not any productions of note written in the Scottish dialect. Barbour calls his language "English;" and as he was, by special permission of Edward III., allowed with three other scholars to study in the university of Oxford for one year, it may be supposed that he became acquainted with the English language, and that he introduced it to some extent in his writings. It has been said, indeed, that for the beauty of its style his poetry is not inferior to that of his contemporary, Chaucer.

SECTION II.

Architecture. — The architecture of this period, whether sacred, civil, or military, was of a similar character to that which was introduced towards the end of the preceding period, but it was brought to greater perfection. Many of the cathedrals erected in the lighter Gothic style, now existing, as those of York, Salisbury, Lichfield, Worcester, Gloucester, Ely, and Winchester, are fine examples of this style of architecture. One of the most beautiful and perfect specimens is that of Salisbury Cathedral, and as it stands pre-eminent among English ecclesiastical edifices for the symmetry of its proportions, the harmonious adjustment of its various parts, the elaborate richness of its members, and the grandeur of the whole, it may be interesting not only to give a brief description of it, but also—as it will well illustrate what means the churches of this period were raised of its origin.

The bishopric of Salisbury was created A.D. 1075, the union of the sees of Wilton and Sherburne. that time the seat of the bishop was at Old rum, where a cathedral was built. But Old Sarum s a fortified town, and the priests and the soldiers ld not agree. Holinshed, in his Chronicle, writes: a the time of the civil wars the soldiers of the tle and canons of Old Sarum fell at odds, insomuch t after often brawls they fell at last to sad blows. happened, therefore, in a Rogation week, that the rgy going in a solemn procession a controversy fell ween them about certain walks and limits, which one side claimed and the other denied. Such also s the hot entertainment on each part, that at last castellans, espying their time, got between the rgy and the town, and so coiled them as they urned homeward that they feared to gang about bounds for the year." The then bishop was rbert Poore, or Pauper, who, notwithstanding his me, was a wealthy prelate; and in order to avoid ch quarrels for the future, he petitioned King chard I. to permit him to remove his see to a place where his canons could not be thus molested. Richard readily gave his assent; but Herbert Poore was as prudent as he was wealthy, and having recalculated the expenses attending the removal of his seat, he forewent his intention. While he lived, the soldiers and his canons still occupied Old Sarum, but when he died, A.D. 1217, his brother, Richard Poore, who succeeded him, and who was a man of lofty purpose and resolute character, was determined not to submit to military control, and to remove the scandal of the continued strife between the canons and castellans. Richard took such measures as soon swept away all difficulties, for he obtained a bull from Pope Honorious for the removal of his cathedrals and canons; and thus armed he commenced proceedings. As he designed erecting no common structure, his first step was to insure the means whereby he might carry out his design with full success. He called a chapter, and having explained his views, he induced each canon and vicar to bind himself to contribute one-fourth of his income towards defraying the expenses of the new structure, himself setting the example. But the question arose where was the seat of his bishopric to be fixed? The good prelate seems to have been sorely puzzled on that point. For a long time he pondered the matter over in his mind but in vain. At length, however, according to the Chronicle, he was miraculously aided. In a vision of the night the Virgin appeared to him, and told him to build it in Merry-field. But, according to the story, the Virgin might as well have told him to build it in the moon, for it goes on to say that neither the prelate nor his canons knew where Merry-field was situate. But their old enemies, the soldiers, came to the bishop's aid, although unwillingly. As he was passing a group of them who were trying their bows, he overheard one of them wager that he could shoot his bolt into that same Merry-field, and on inquiring where that field was, it was politely pointed out to him. In Merry-field, therefore, Richard Poore set his mark by the erection of a temporary wooden chapel. This done, he set about collecting money from all quarters. Preachers and deputations were sent round the country to collect from the religious community, and pardons and indulgences were issued for all who should contribute to the good work. The fancy fairs and bazaars of modern days, which are wont to be held to aid in the erection and restoration of churches, would not have aided the good prelate half so effectually, as did his sale of pardons and indulgences. He had no lack of aid. The rich gave of their abundance, and the poor of their poverty; many of them also giving their labour freely. Moreover, the young King Henry III. granted a charter.

On the day of St. Vitalis the Martyr, April 28th, A.D. 1220, there was a large assemblage of prelates and nobles and people collected in Merry-field. They were there to witness the ceremony of laying the foundation of the new cathedral. According to De Wanda, the bishop's dean, who drew up a chronicle of the proceedings, the bishop, having first performed divine service in the wooden chapel, put off his shoes reverently, and accompanied by the clergy chanting the Litany, proceeded in procession to the place of foundation. He then consecrated the ground, solemnly

dedicating it to the service of the Most High. He next preached a suitable sermon to the assembled multitude. Then taking the necessary instruments in his hands, he laid the first stone for Pope Honorius, the second for the archbishop of Canterbury, and the third for himself. After this the earl of Salisbury and his countess each laid a stone for themselves, as did also several noblemen and the several officers of the cathedral: the people shouting and weeping for joy, "and all contributing thereto their alms with a ready mind, according to the ability which God had given them."

Old Sarum soon became deserted—the castellans excepted—for soon after the foundation of the new cathedral the bishop and his canons left it and the people followed them: the more wealthy, because they too had suffered oppression from the military, and the poor, fearing to lose their "bellie cheere." Holinshed records this singular migration thus: "This year—1221—the priests or canons that inhabited within the king's castle of Old Salisbury removed with the bishop's see into New Salisbury, which by the king was made a city. The bishop, Richard, procured this removing through the king's help, who was very willing thereunto, as it seemed by his charters largely granted in that behalf." The work thus commenced went on vigorously. The good bishop, however, had some difficulties to contend with before it was finished. His canons had signed and sealed a contract or obligation to give up one-fourth of their income for seven years towards the cost of the erection; but some of them evidently failed to fulfil their engagement, for Richard issued decrees which made those who were defaulters liable to have their corn seized from their prebendal acres and sold for the amount due. But so successful did the bishop hasten on the works, that in about five years the cathedral was opened for divine service. The solemnity at its opening was not less splendid than at its foundation. The service commenced on the vigil of Michaelmas, A.D. 1225. In the presence of the archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, the bishop consecrated three altars, one situated to the east to the Trinity and All Saints for the continual performance of mass to the Blessed Virgin; another in the north to St. Peter; and the third to the south to St. Stephen and all the martyrs. On the next day, Otto, the Pope's nuncio, with the two archbishops and other prelates, with a large assemblage of nobles and people, crowded to the cathedral, and divine service was solemnly performed. After this King Henry and his grand justiciary, Hubert de Burgh, on two occasions visited the cathedral, both times hearing the mass of the glorious Virgin and making rich offerings. Henry, also, granted to the church a yearly fair of eight days' continuance. Finally, "in the year 1226, on the feast of Trinity, which was then on the 18th of the calend of July, the bodies of three bishops were translated from the castle of Sarum to the new fabric; namely, the body of the blessed Osmund, the body of Bishop Roger, and the body of Bishop Joceline." But, although opened for divine service, the cathedral was not finished while Richard Poore was bishop of Salisbury. The work was continued but slowly by his successor, William de York, and was finally completed by Giles de Bridport, A.D. 1258, when it was fully dedicated in the presence of Boniface, archbishop of Canterbury, and a numerous body of prelates, nobles, and people. The upper part of the tower and spire, however, was added at a later date; probably in the reign of Edward III., who gave a grant of "all the stone walls of the former cathedral of Old Sarum, and the houses which lately belonged to the bishop and canons of the said cathedral, within our castle of Old Sarum, to have and to hold, as our gift for the improvement of the church of New Sarum, and the close thereunto belonging."

The cathedral thus raised is one of chaste splendour, and is considered to be almost perfection itself. Rickman says of it: "This edifice has the advantage of being built in one style, the Early English, and from an uniform and well-arranged plan. On the whole, it presents an object for study hardly equalled by any in the kingdom; the purity of its style, and the various modes of adapting that style to the purposes required, deserve the most attentive consideration. It consists entirely of a nave with two lateral aisles, a large transept, with an eastern aisle branching off from the tower, a smaller transept with an aisle east of the former, a choir with lateral aisles, a space east of the choir, and a Lady chapel at the east end. On the north side of the church is a large porch with a room over it, and rising from the intersection of the transept with the nave is a lofty tower and spire. South of the church is a square cloister with a library over half of the eastern side, a chapter house, a consistory court, and an octangular apartment called the muniment room." The interior is richly adorned with finely-carved capitals and sculpture, and its exterior is remarkably beautiful. Its

SALISBURY CATHEDRAL, WEST FRONT.

windows, which are numerous, are handsome specimens of the Early English or Pointed style. All its parts have an air of magnificence; but its most striking feature is the spire, which is loftier than any in England, and which, when viewed from the plain below, is calculated to impress the mind with a feeling of solemn awe.



CLOISTERS, SALISBURY CATHEDRAL.



EARLY ENGLISH CAPITALS.



WINDOWS, FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

The castles of this period were similar to those of the Anglo-Norman times, although, as in sacred architecture, they displayed greater taste and skill in workmanship. In like manner the architecture of manor-houses underwent a gradual improvement, they consisted of a hall, or the one great room of the establishment, a private chamber for the master of the house, a kitchen which was a separate but adjacent building, a sewery, and a buttery. Towards the close of the thirteenth century they were allowed to be embattled, and surrounded by moats, so that they may be considered to have been castles in miniature. The more domestic style was far more simple, consisting chiefly of plain gabled outlines without any attempt at display, although the decorations of some of them were, for the age in which they were built, elegant and tasteful. The progress of architecture was greatly assisted by societies styled "Free Masons," which consisted chiefly of Italians, Greeks, French, Germans, and Flemings, who went from one nation to another as they found patronage for their skill. This fraternity of architects was under strict rules of self-government, and was greatly encouraged by the Pope, the clergy, and the nobles.

Sculpture and Painting.—Sculpture and painting made some advances during this period, though not so noticeable as architecture. Montfaucon says that the sculptors of the thirteenth century greatly excelled their predecessors in several respects; but, besides those which have been defaced by time and the action of the weather, many statues and sculptures which ornamented the cathedrals and churches were demolished at the time of the Reformation, so that few remain whereby the skill of the sculptor can be tested. Those that do exist are ill drawn and deficient in principle, but at the same time display considerable skill in execution. Sculptors of this period found much employment in decorating the tombs of the great and the shrines of saints—an example of which may be seen in the shrine of Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey. This was executed by Cavalini, a Roman sculptor, but there is evidence that the art was cultivated with much success by natives. Painting appears to have been cultivated with greater diligence and success than sculpture, and especially during the reign of Henry III., who was a munificent patron of the fine arts. Several painters were constantly in his service; but with what degree of taste their various productions were executed there are now no means of ascertaining. Henry's successors were not so fond of painting as he was, but still the art continued to flourish. There is reason to believe that the taste for painting was wide-spread throughout the country. In the reign of Edward III. painters were impressed from no less than fourteen counties to complete the paintings in the chapel of Westminster, which had been commenced under the auspices of his predecessors. Whatever their merits were, therefore, they must have been very numerous. It is clear that not only the walls of churches and palaces, but the very bedchambers of the wealthy, were pictorially ornamented. Chaucer in his palmy days appears to have slept in such a bedchamber; for when he was aroused from his poetical dream, he expresses his surprise that all the gay objects seen in his slumbers had vanished, and that he saw nothing—

> Save on the wals old portraiture
> Of horsmen, haukes, and houndis,
> And hart dire all full of woundis.

Painting on glass, which was executed in medallions of various forms, inlaid upon a kind of mosaic ground in brilliant colours, was much practised, and brought to considerable perfection. So, also, was the art of illuminating still cultivated, as existing MSS. preserved in rare libraries testify. It is to this kind of painting that Chaucer alludes in his description of the squire, or knight's son, where he says,—

> Songis he could make and well endite,
> Just, and eke daunce, and well portraie, and write.

This would convey an idea that painting was at the time Chaucer wrote a fashionable amusement.

Poetry.—There were numerous poets in the thirteenth century, but their productions are now almost wholly obsolete. They appear chiefly to have consisted of sonnets, short pieces of poetry on a variety of subjects, metrical chronicles, and metrical romances. The languages in which they were written were either Latin, French, or English, the latter being almost as unintelligible to modern readers as the former. The metrical chronicles of the age were rhyming histories, replete with absurd fables derived from the pages of the mythical chroniclers, such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's; while the metrical romances celebrated the wonderful achievements of valiant and gentle knights in the most extravagant and hyperbolical language. The distinctive poetry of this period, however, and that which will be handed down to posterity for ages to come, was written by Langland, Gower, and Chaucer, of whom express mention is made under the head of literature. Their compositions rescue the age from the imputation of barbarism—and especially those of the two latter poets.

Music.—The art of music was cultivated in England from a very early date, but for many ages it was a mere accessory to its sister art of poetry. As in the time of the Anglo-Saxons, minstrels were still the poets and musicians of England. And history records that they were a numerous fraternity, possessing many privileges, and held in high estimation by all classes of society. Minstrels were everywhere welcome, and could gain ready access to the greatest personages on the most solemn occasions. Walsingham relates that when Edward II., in A.D. 1316, solemnized the feast of Pentecost, and sat at table in the great hall of Westminster, surrounded by his nobles, a female, dressed in the habit of a minstrel, and riding on a horse trapped in the minstrel fashion, entered the hall, and having delivered a letter to the king, which contained some animadversions on his conduct, turned her horse's head and departed without molestation. As in former ages, the harp continued to be the favourite instrument of minstrels, but there is evidence to show that they knew and used a variety of other instruments. A manuscript roll of the offices of Edward III. contains a list of performers on the oboe, trumpet, clarion, dulcimer, tabret, violin, and flute; and Chaucer, in his 'Canterbury Tales' and 'House of Fame,' mentions other instruments as in use at this period. According to Chaucer, music and singing were not confined to minstrels, properly so called, at the time he wrote. His miller was a musician, for

> A bagge piper, well couth he blow and sowne,
> And therewithal brought he us out of towne.

His parish clerk, also, was no mean proficient in music and singing—

> In twenty manir couth he trip and dance,
> After the Scole of Oxenford tho,
> And with his legs casten to and fro,
> And playing songs on a small ribible,
> Thereto he song sometime a loud quenible,
> And as well couth he play on a giterne.

In the 'Romaunt of the Rose,' the same poet speaks of a lady's singing in terms implying much vocal ability and knowledge of music—

> Well coud she sing and lustily
> None halfe so well, and seemily;
> And couth make in song such refraining,
> It sate her wondir well to sing;
> Her voice full clear was, and full swete.

As regards church music after the introduction of organs, so many of the public offices were sung to its pealing sounds, that its study became necessary to all who wished to take any part in those offices. It was studied and taught in all colleges, cathedrals, convents, and the larger churches, so that in the thirteenth century the clergy as a body were proficients in both instrumental and vocal music. Chaucer's nun was proficient in church music—

> Full wele she song the service divine.

So was his friar—

> Certainly he had a merry note,
> Well couth he sing, and playin on a rote.

The music and singing of this period, however, must have been attended by many imperfections, as musical notation was unknown. Although there were some good writers on music, no remains of British musical compositions of this period are in existence.

Miscellaneous Arts.—The arts of refining and working metals appear to have been greatly improved in this period. This was the age when philosophers were keenly engaged in making experiments whereby they hoped to discover the philosopher's stone: a pursuit which, if fruitless as regarded the main object of their research, could not fail to lead to a better acquaintance with the nature and composition of metals, and with the arts of compounding, melting, and refining them. Defensive armour and offensive arms were fabricated with well-tempered and polished steel, and many useful utensils, and even statues, were made of brass and copper. In the year 1395 two citizens of London, who were coppersmiths, received four hundred pounds for two statues of Richard II. and his queen, which were made of copper and gilt. These statues represented the sovereigns with crowns on their heads, their right hands joined, and holding sceptres in their left hands. These appear to have been intended for memorial statues, for at that time the good Queen Anne was dead, and Richard did not fetch his child-bride from France till the year 1396. Workers in gold and jewellery were very numerous and skilful in this age. In the reign of Edward III., the goldsmiths of London made a representation to him that many of their

had lost their sight and their health by of the fire and the fumes of quicksilver, n he granted them leave to found and en- hospital for the reception of the sufferers. r workmanship was excellent is clear from descriptions of gold and silver plate inter- the written records of the period. Knygh- that when Richard and Queen Anne made mphal entry into London, the citizens made esent each of a crown of gold, at the Foun- heapside; and that when they had advanced rther, the king had a table of gold presented whereon there was a representation of the nd the queen had a table of gold presented hereon was a figure of St. Anne, the two eing worth about sixteen hundred pounds, twenty thousand pounds of present money. es on these tables appear to have been em- enchased, an art then brought to great , as was the still more delicate art of g plate and jewels; in proof of which it may ned that enamelled plate formed part of the reasures of Piers Gaveston. That England n gold and silver at this age is certain; for s abounded in silver, silver-gilt, and gold the Church possessed gold and silver vessels, d altar-tables of immense value. Precious re also abundant in England, and although ch adorned the rings and ornaments of the re cut and set by foreign lapidaries, the art pidary was practised to some extent by ists.

Clocks and watches came into use in this period. A clock which cost eight hundred marks was placed in the tower opposite the gate of Westminster Hall, A.D. 1288, and four years after, another was set up in the cathedral of Canterbury. These appear to have been of foreign workmanship, for about seventy years after, Edward III. invited three foreign clockmakers to come to England, and granted them his royal protection to carry on their trade without molestation. Before the close of this period clocks became somewhat common, especially in cathedral and conventual churches, and the art of making them was brought to a considerable degree of perfection by native ingenuity. One of the most celebrated clockmakers in the reign of Richard II. was Richard de Wallingford, abbot of St. Albans, of whom Leland speaks as the most famous mathematician, astronomer, and mechanic of his age. Abbot Wallingford is said to have fabricated a clock which not only measured time and struck the hours, but represented the revolutions of the sun and moon, the fixed stars, and the ebbing and flowing of the sea; and lest it should be ruined by the ignorance of the monks, he wrote a book of directions for managing it and keeping it in order. That clocks became common in ecclesiastical structures may be gathered from Chaucer, who compares the crowing of a cock to a church organ for sweetness, and to a church clock for exactness of time, in these lines:—

> His voice was merier than the merie orgon
> On masse day is that in the churches gon,
> Well sikerer was his crowing in his loge
> Than is a clock, or abbaye horologe.

CHAPTER V.

The History of Industry, Commerce, &c., from A.D. 1216 to A.D. 1399

. — VERY little progress was made in e during this period. It was an age of war, aceful occupations. It was even thought able for any person of rank to attend to the ent of land. Edward II. was not only l, but despised for his fondness for agri- d neglect of warlike exercises. The lands reat barons and prelates were cultivated their villains or serfs, and partly by their but as they had little or no interest in the their labours, they were careless of bringing action. Great jealousy existed between land- tenants; and hence the culture of lands glected. Both parties appear to have sur- hemselves with precautions detrimental to ess of the great art of agriculture. The ulated that the landlord should not interfere mode of culture; and the landlord stipulated nt should be paid within two days after it nd if not paid within a fortnight he could nd if not in a month he could re-enter upon sion of the land. The frequent and destruc- es which occurred at this period may be taken as presumptive proofs of the imperfect state of agriculture, although historians ascribe them to unfavourable seasons, and not to bad husbandry. Some writers also represent that improvident consumption immediately after harvest contributed to the evil; but although the two latter causes may have had their effects, it is clear that the leading cause was unskilful culture. In the great famine which commenced in the year 1314, and which raged for three years both in England and Scotland, the dearth became so appalling that wheat was sold for forty shillings the quarter, which was equivalent to thirty pounds of the present money. Even when the seasons were genial, if the notices on agricultural affairs contained in a law book of the period, entitled "Fleta," are to be relied on, land often yielded only three times the quantity sown. But this may refer to lands of an indifferent quality, for it is clear that some lands must have been more productive, as sometimes grain was so abundant that a quarter of wheat was sold for the low price of a shilling or sixteen-pence. That land was indifferently farmed, however, may well be believed, as it is on record that the highest rent was

sevenpence an acre, and that some was let at the low rental of one farthing an acre. Some was even held without money payment, labour being substituted, and the labourer receiving, in addition to freedom from rent, porridge for his services. The cultivation of land appears to have been carried on by the same process as in the previous period, but it would appear that it was more universally performed. Greater attention was also paid to the protection of the crops from the straying of cattle, for arable lands were now generally enclosed with hedges and ditches, with trees planted in the hedgerows. Greater attention, however, was paid to gardening than to field-culture. That being more especially under the protection of the nobility, was brought to considerable perfection during this era. Almost every castle and monastery had its kitchen-garden, herbary, and orchard; and some of them also had valuable vineyards. The orchards contained a variety of fruit-trees which are commonly believed to have been introduced into England at a later date. Matthew Paris distinctly mentions apples, pears, cherries, plums, figs, and shell-fruits. That vineyards were cultivated also is certain. Wine is said to have been made in considerable quantities, and to have been but little inferior to that of foreign countries. Bishop Swinfield's vineyard at Ledbury produced, in the autumn of A.D. 1289, seven casks of wine, and one of verjuice; but wine which was consumed in large quantities in the households of the wealthy, was chiefly derived from Spain, Greece, and Syria.

Commerce.—The English have always been a commercial people. Many of the nobility of the present day owe their elevation in society to the commercial enterprise of their ancestors. War and statesmanship have ennobled families, but not more so than peaceful commerce. In the period now under review, there were great impediments and embarrassments to trade, created by ignorant and contradictory legislation; but, notwithstanding, the commercial spirit of the people triumphed over them. Moreover, if some of the laws were adverse, others favoured the extension of commerce, so that, on the whole, it made considerable progress.

The internal trade was burdened with petty taxes and imposts, some of which were demanded by every town, and by every baron through whose boundaries traders conveyed their goods, and at every place where they exposed them for sale. Then, again, although that trade was an object of great importance at this period, it was ill-managed. In some places the prices of the most valuable and necessary commodities were sometimes more than double what they were in others. Thus, in the year 1258, while a quarter of wheat was sold at Dunstable for six shillings and sixpence, at Northampton it was sold for three times that amount, a fact that proves the intelligence of the age was defective, and the commercial intercourse between the different parts of the kingdom irregular. The greater part of the domestic trade was still carried on in fairs, some of which were of long duration, and frequented by great numbers of people, native and foreign. Fairs afforded almost the only opportunity for the sale of the common and staple commodities of England. It was at fairs that kings, prelates, barons, and common people alike purchased whatever they needed. At fairs were purchased jewels, plate, cloths, furniture, liquors, spices, horses, cattle, corn, and all the necessaries of life. Even men and women slaves were, down to the end of the fourteenth century, publicly sold in the fairs of England, like beasts of burden.

Foreign commerce was greatly extended. Commercial treaties were entered into by the English kings with several sovereigns and states, as Genoa, Venice, Pisa, Florence, and other free cities of Italy, which were at that time the chief seats of trade in Europe. Such treaties also existed between England and Spain, Portugal, the Mediterranean Islands, Flanders, Brabant, and Norway. And if there were no actual treaties, a flourishing trade was carried on with Germany and the Hanse towns, Holland, Prussia, and even Denmark, which was now taking rank among the more civilized nations of Europe. The Danes had long been the scourge and terror of Europe by their piratical expeditions, but they had now lost much of their ferocity as well as power, and traded peaceably with other nations, and especially England. As regards France and Scotland, very little commercial intercourse existed through the whole of this period, that intercourse being prevented by the fierce animosities engendered by the long and bloody wars which marked this epoch. This was especially the case with Scotland, for the animosity of the three Edwards was so fiercely displayed towards that country, that for one hundred years trade with the Scots was prohibited; and commercial intercourse between the two nations was not restored till the year 1386, when, by a truce between the wardens of the marches of both kingdoms, it was agreed that the merchants of Scotland and England and their goods should have "special assurance on the sea, fra the water of Spie to the water of Tamye."

A powerful impulse was given to navigation and commerce at this time by the introduction of the mariner's compass. Several salutary laws were also passed for their advancement. The navigation acts of the reign of Richard II., which commanded English merchants to freight none but English ships, were especially adapted to promote navigation and commerce, inasmuch as they contributed to the increase both of ships and mariners. Other statutes in this reign invited foreign merchants to import the commodities of their respective countries, and to export those of England, promising them full protection if they paid their debts and the king's customs punctually. Thus invited, many "Merchant Strangers" settled in London and the great towns of England, and formed themselves into companies, some of which were kinds of corporations. Anterior to these enactments there had been a company of German merchants of the Steel-yard in London which had greatly flourished. This company had been settled in England before the Conquest, but it now became more powerful and opulent; partly from its connection with the famous confederacy of the Hanse towns, and partly from the additional privileges conferred upon it by the Plantagenet monarchs. A company called "the Merchants of the Staple" belongs to this era, and it was formed for this double purpose: to purchase and



SHIPS, TIME, RICHARD II.

llect all that could be spared of the chief commodi-
s of the kingdom, and to convey them to certain
wns, that the king's customs might be readily col-
ted, and that foreign merchants might know where
y could be purchased; and to export those com-
dities to foreign countries, and import returns for
em in goods, coin, or bullion. This important
mpany had many privileges and immunities con-
red upon it by law, and it was made felony to
empt to deprive it of any of these privileges. An
ociation, formed by English merchants for trading
foreign countries, called the Brotherhood of St.
omas à-Becket of Canterbury, is said to have ex-
ed; but, if so, it subsequently merged into the
mpany of "Merchant Adventurers," which became
nous for several centuries. Besides these, there
re several companies of Italian merchants in Eng-
d at this period, for managing the trade of the
tes and cities with which they were connected.
eat jealousy was entertained by the English against
se "Merchant Strangers," but they were protected
the kings, prelates, and barons, who made many
vs for their security and encouragement. At times,
wever, it would appear that the Londoners defied
protection afforded to their rivals by treating
m with great cruelty. Walsingham says that on
occasion they hired assassins, who murdered a
h Genoese merchant in the streets, his offence being
t he had presented a petition to Richard II. for
rmission to deposit his goods in the Castle of
thampton, promising that he would so extend the
de of England with the East that the price of a
nd of pepper would be reduced to fourpence, and
other spices in the same proportion. As a rule,
wever, the foreign merchants of this period were
ll protected by the several kings; except the Jews,
o, as before recorded, were plundered, and finally
elled the kingdom.

But while some of the laws relating to commerce in this period had a salutary tendency, others were very pernicious. Among the latter was a statute of Edward II., which fixed a certain price upon provisions of all kinds, which, from its mischievous effects, was soon repealed. Of a similar character was a law made in the reign of Edward III., which commanded that no English merchant should deal in more than one article either by himself or by an agent, and that every one should fix upon the article in which he desired to trade before the term of Candlemas. This absurd law, which was made A.D. 1363, was soon repealed. Other laws required English traders to bring the staple produce of the kingdom—as wool, woolfells, leather, lead, and tin—to particular towns; the wisdom of which is very questionable. But of all the laws passed in this period, that which made it felony for any one to export these staple commodities was one of the most pernicious. So, also, was that which prohibited the importation of foreign cloths. These unwise laws, however, were not enforced with rigour, and were soon allowed to become a dead letter in the Statute Book. Among other absurd laws of this period, one prohibited either coined money or bullion being carried out of the kingdom on any account; and another enacted that no person should carry out of the kingdom either money or plate without a special licence, upon pain of forfeiture of whatever he should so convey away. This law was for some time rigidly enforced, but, notwithstanding, it was extensively evaded, and at length it was somewhat relaxed by a permission given to foreign merchants to carry away one-half of the money produced by their articles of merchandize. By other laws of this period, equally absurd and hurtful to the commercial community, all foreign cloths were to be of a certain measure, on pain of forfeiture to the king; English merchants were prohibited from importing wine from Gascony, or to buy such wine if brought into the country by a merchant stranger; and foreign merchants were made responsible for the debts, and even punishable for the crimes of any of his countrymen who had become insolvent or had escaped from justice. Other laws of a similar character were enacted during this era, but in numerous instances their mischievous tendencies on the interests of commerce—about which the kings and parliaments of England manifested great anxiety—soon became so apparent that they were either repealed or allowed to be broken with impunity.

It is evident from these statutes, that the legislators of this period were not aware that the best and most effectual encouragement for commerce is to leave it unrestricted, and to allow the merchants of one country to deal with those of other countries without restraint. This ignorance may be further illustrated

by a reference to statutes made at this era against the supposed mischiefs of forestalling; that is, of purchasing goods in times of abundance to sell at a future time, when those goods have become scarce in the market. Such an offence was, for instance, emphatically denounced by the Statute "De Pistoribus"—by some ascribed to the reign of Henry III., and by others to that of Edward I.—in these terms: "But especially be it commanded, on the behalf of our lord the king, that no forestaller be suffered to dwell in any town, which is an open oppressor of poor people and of all the commonalty, and an enemy of all the shire and county; which for greediness of his private gains, doth prevent others in buying grain, fish, herring, or anything to be sold coming by land or by water, oppressing the poor and deceiving the rich; which carrieth away such things intending to sell them more dear, the which come to merchant strangers that bring merchandize offering them to buy, and informing them that their goods might be dearer sold than they intended to sell, and a whole town or county is deceived by such craft and subtlety." Such statutes as these struck a blow at the very root of commercial enterprise, and it was long before English legislators became aware of their absurdity; for it was not till towards the close of the eighteenth century that they were finally removed from the Statute Book.

But with all the impediments thrown in the way of commercial enterprise by the ignorance of the legislators of this period, commerce flourished. This is evidenced by the fact that the balance of trade was greatly in favour of England, for it is on record that, while in the year 1354 the value of the imports was under 40,000*l.*, the exports amounted to nearly 300,000*l.*; or, if we take the present value of money, the imports were about 450,000*l.*, and the exports 3,420,000*l.* The imports of this period chiefly consisted of silks, fine cloths, wines, spices, and some few other articles of luxury, which were used only by the royal family and the more wealthy of the prelates and barons; while the exports consisted of wool, wool fells, leather, tin, corn, butter, cheese, coarse cloths, and other commodities of general use, which, to whatever country they were taken, found a ready market. It was from the balance of trade that the large sums taken out of England by the kings of this period and by the court of Rome and foreign ecclesiastics were supplied; for, as there were no gold or silver mines of any great value, it is clear that it was from the trade of the country these sums were in reality supplied. Hence, though the commerce of this period was trifling in comparison to what it is at present, it is plain that it was, in proportion to its extent, of great advantage to the nation. It is also evident, from this example, that the most effectual means which any people can employ for turning the balance of trade in their own favour are these: to be sparing in the use of imported luxuries, and to supply every possible article of utility for exportation.

That the money drawn out of the country must have been previously brought into it in exchange for manufactures or produce sent abroad, appears from another circumstance, which proves also the existence of bills of exchange at this period. As recorded in a previous page, Henry III. obtained a considerable sum of money from the Pope for supporting the project of making his son, Edmund, king of Sicily. To enable him to lend the money to the English monarch, the Pope borrowed it from Italian merchants. By the suggestion of the bishop of Hereford, the Pope authorized his creditors to draw bills for large amounts upon the most wealthy of the English ecclesiastics. These bills were sent by the Italian merchants to their English creditors, and their payment by the English ecclesiastics, on whom they were drawn, was enforced by the royal and papal authority. By this means the sum of 150,000 marks was raised, and considered as a payment from the king to the Pope, every one being satisfied, except the English prelates and abbots. This was the origin of payment of accounts between merchants residing in different countries by bills of exchange. From that time the system became common, and in 1381 a law was made encouraging, or rather commanding, the use of bills in making remittances to foreign countries.

The exports and imports of England consisted nearly of the same articles in this as in the preceding period. That of wool was the great staple of the kingdom. According to a record of the exports and imports, preserved in the exchequer, in the year 1354 wool constituted about thirteen-fourteenths of the exports of that date.

It seems singular that no great attention had been paid to woollen manufacture. The people of Flanders and the Netherlands had grown rich by the wool which they derived from England, for they were the chief manufacturers of woollen cloth in Europe. Some encouragement had from time to time been given to native manufacture, and at length its advantages became so apparent that Edward III. made great and successful efforts for its extension and permanent establishment. In the fifth year of his reign a Flemish artisan, with his workmen and apprentices, came over to England, and were taken under his special protection; and these were followed in the succeeding years of his reign by many others. All who came were welcomed and protected by him, notwithstanding the opposition made to their settlement in England by the burgesses of many of the principal towns, and especially by the citizens of London. Edward was warmly supported in his views by his parliament, which made several statutes for the encouragement of home woollen manufacture. Thus, by one statute, it was made felony to export wool until the king and his council ordered otherwise; by a second, it was enacted that no foreign cloths should be imported into England under the penalty of the forfeiture of the cloths; by a third, it was ordained that no one except the royal family should wear cloths made out of England; and by a fourth, clothworkers of all countries were invited to come and settle in the king's dominions. These laws, as will be seen, were not executed in their fullest extent, but they greatly contributed to the establishment of the woollen manufacture in England, so much so, that early in the reign of Richard II. native woollen manufactures became an article of export.

It may also be noticed that corn was sometimes exported and sometimes imported, but apparently never

he special licence of the crown. One article
ı trade and of home consumption, which at
nt day is of the utmost value, was added to
ts and imports during this era, and there-
ires express mention. This was Newcastle
is first mentioned, A.D. 1245, in a docu
ch contains an order from Henry III. to
uisition into trespasses committed in the
ests, inquiry respecting sea-coal being es-
irected. It seems probable from this that
previously been brought to London by sea,
ably from Newcastle. It is said, indeed,
urgesses of Newcastle had obtained liberty
als from Henry III., in the Castle Muir,
and if so, there can be no doubt that some
brought to London in the interval of the
tes. These burgesses appear to have ob-
› property of that mine from Edward III.,
; and then it was that they set about vigo-
extend the trade. Prejudices against its
omestic purposes had then given way, for it
thought that the smoke or smell of a coal
noxious. Thus Maitland, in his 'History of
writes: "This year, 1306, sea-coals being
h used in the suburbs of London by brewers,
d others requiring great fires, the nobility
ry resorting thither, complained thereof to
as a public nuisance, whereby, they said, the
nfested with a noisome smell and a thick
he great endangering of the health of the
ts: wherefore a proclamation was issued,
rbidding the use of that fuel. But little
ing paid thereunto, the king appointed a
m of oyer and terminer to inquire after
› had contumaciously acted in open defiance
oclamation, strictly commanding all such to
ned by pecuniary mulcts, and for the second
have their kilns and furnaces destroyed."
es, however, still continued to be worked;
id that, in the year 1325, coals were exported
'castle to France; and that two years later,
ngs' worth of Newcastle coals were purchased
ronation of Edward III. Before the close
urteenth century an active and lucrative
› carried on in the conveyance of coals to
nd other places at home and abroad. It is
in 'Hakluyt's Voyages,' that a ship belong-
e burgesses of Newcastle was, in the year
ed in the Baltic on her voyage to Prussia:
› being of two hundred tons burden, and
; four hundred pounds, equal in weight of
one thousand pounds present money, ex-
f her cargo. By the important article of
'castle was raised into a great commercial
one of the very few additions made to the
ts of trade during this period. Hull, or
-upon-Hull, a borough and sea-port in York-
y be mentioned, also, as another remarkable
Though it was not founded till A.D. 1296,
ed so rapidly that in less than a century it
› rich and populous commercial town, a
n which it has retained to the present day,
ow deemed the fourth port in the kingdom.
—No mention is made by any writer, flourish-
his period, of living money, whence it seems
clear that coins made of the precious metals were the only representatives of all articles of commerce. As regards the denominations and relative value of the different kinds of English money, they continued the same as in the preceding period. When Henry III. came to the throne, the coinage had been greatly corrupted by clipping and counterfeits, and it was called in, and a new coinage was issued of silver pennies, halfpence, and farthings; all of which money was now made round. But although thus purified, the coinage soon became corrupted. Early in the reign of Edward I. there was base money of various denominations, as pollards, crockards, mitres, leonines, rosaries, staldings, steepings, and eagles, some of which were imitations of English money, and others professing to be foreign coins. The round money of Henry III. had also been extensively clipped, and various laws of great severity were made to remedy these evils. As before recorded, the Jews were charged with these offences, and punished by fines, exile, and death. But singular to relate, Edward himself subsequently depreciated the coin by diminishing its legal weight, making two hundred and forty three instead of two hundred and forty pennies, as heretofore, out of the pound of silver. The same king issued a new silver coin called a groat, or great penny, which was of the value of four pennies hitherto in circulation. Henry III. had previously issued a gold penny, which was to pass for twenty pennies of silver, but it was soon recalled, as the Londoners complained that it was rated above its value. It has been said that no specimens of this earliest English coinage of gold are known to exist; but this is a mistake, for a specimen in the cabinet of select coins collected by Captain Murchison was sold, A.D. 1864, for the large sum of one hundred and forty pounds. No coin appears to have been struck by Edward II., but his son and successor, Edward III., made a material alteration in the state of the coin of England. In the year 1344 he commanded florins of gold to be coined of the value of six shillings and eightpence, and halves and quarters of florins. The rare quarter florin of this king produced, at Captain Murchison's sale, at the date above-mentioned, one hundred and seventy pounds. Edward III. still further depreciated the coin, for in the same year he issued his celebrated florins he also issued silver pennies, of which two-hundred and sixty-six were made out of the pound; two years later he coined two hundred and seventy pennies out of the pound of silver; and in 1351 he issued a new groat, or great penny, which was to pass for four pennies, although it did not weigh more than three and a half of his depreciated pennies. These groats are of two kinds, one bearing the title of king of France, and the other without. It is on the coins of Edward III. that the motto of "*Dieu et mon droit*,"—that is, "God and my right,"—is first impressed, and it was originally adopted in allusion to his claim to the French crown. His florin, or noble, was struck to commemorate the naval victory which he obtained over the French, A.D. 1340, for on it he is represented, full-armed, in a ship, with a naked sword in his right hand. His florins, half and quarter-florins, continued to be the chief gold coins to the end of this period; although his grandson, Richard II., appears to have

struck some of the same value, as he did also of groats, half-groats, half-pence, and pence, all of which were of the same values as those issued by his grandfather.

SEAL, EDWARD I.

PENNY, EDWARD I.

GROAT, EDWARD III.

In Scotland money was deteriorated during t period to a greater extent than in England. Thi evidenced by a proclamation which Edward I deemed it necessary to issue against its use in E land in the year 1355. That proclamation re thus: "The ancient money of Scotland was, till th times, of the same weight and alloy as our sterli money of England, and therefore did always p current in England. But because new money of t same form and denominations with the old, but inferior weight and fineness, hath been lately coin in Scotland, and is current in our kingdom, it necessary to prevent this, which would be a manif loss to our people. We command, therefore, th proclamation be made in all cities and towns, Th none of our subjects take that new money of Scotla in payment, except for its real value as bullion to brought to our mint; and that the old money sh have the same currency as usual." To what exte this new money of Scotland was depreciated at t date of this proclamation is not known, but in t year 1367 the parliament of Scotland ordered that less than three hundred and fifty-two pennies shou be made out of the pound of silver, or eighty-t more than Edward's own depreciated pennies. Bef the close of the century the difference appears to ha become still greater; for, by the statute of We minster, A.D. 1390, it was ordered: "That the gr of Scotland shall pass only for twopence in Engla the half-groat for one penny, the penny for a ha penny, and the halfpenny for a farthing." As t the money in Ireland, that was still more valuele and one species—of inferior quality, and probably foreign fabrication, authorized to pass current, A 1339, for lack of good money—had no intrinsic val as a medium of exchange in England or elsewhere.

The legal coins of this period are generally of ru workmanship, and by no means uniform in weig By the statute of assize of weights and measures, was ordained that an English penny, called t sterling, should be round without clipping, and of t weight of "thirty-two grains of wheat dry in t midst of the ear," which, as regards weight, was unsatisfactory as that established for measures length; namely, that the ell should be as long as t arm of Henry I., by whom that measure was order The process of coining was equally rude and simp Leake, in his History of English Money, says t "the metal was first cast from the melting-pot i long bars, those bars were cut with shears into squ pieces of exact weights; then with the tongs a hammer they were forged into a round shape, af which they were blanched, that is, made white refulgent by mealing or boiling, and afterwa stamped or impressed with a hammer, to make th perfect money." He adds, "this kind of hamme money continued through all the succeeding rei till the year 1663, when the milled money t place."

During this period large sums of money w amassed by some of the kings as well as by pri individuals. It is recorded that one of the a bishops of York had in coffers sums equal to hundred thousand pounds of our present money. must be remembered that the nominal money po

real pound of silver, or about three of our l pounds, and that the same quantity of silver, ounce or a pound, would then have purchased y of the necessaries of life as five ounces or unds would at the present day. Matthew ays that Sir William de Lisle, a tyrannical of Northumberland in the year 1256, was having an estate which was reckoned worth ndred and fifty pounds a year;" which, accordhe above computation, would make him as rich ntleman is at present possessing a clear income thousand five hundred pounds a year. Later A.D. 1357, a good house, with seventy acres of land, was let for five pounds per annum, which ual to seventy-five at the present time. The alue of the implements of a carpenter, which d of two axes, an adze, a square, and a traveich was probably a spokeshave, was only esti- o cost one shilling; and the tools and stock of smith at about twelve shillings. As before curate's salary was ordinarily four or five a year only, but it was equal to forty or fifty at present. Then, again, the wages of a day r was only a penny, or at most twopence, however, was equal to eighteenpence, or three s now. The whole moveable property of the f Colchester, which contained about three d inhabitants, was, in the year 1301, of the ed value of five hundred and eighteen pounds cluding the furniture, clothing, and the stock e of bakers, barbers, blacksmiths, butchers, ers, cobblers, cooks, dyers, fullers, furriers, , glass-sellers, glovers, linendrapers, mercers, tailors, tanners, tilers, weavers, woodcutters, abers, and mustard, vinegar, and clothes and yet Colchester was reckoned to be a town derable importance.

ing.—Mention has been made of the mariner's in the preceding period, but it does not aphave been in general use till the present era. nciples of the instrument were then discovered, ne faint attempts had been made to apply them gation; but it was not till about the year 1300 ose principles became developed sufficiently to em of practical utility. The first who attached ed card to the needle is supposed to have ioai of Amalfi; but his card had only eight r winds, drawn upon it, which was afterwards d at different times and in different countries. s discovery did not lead to any great results this age, for there are no records of any great ion having flourished therein. It is said, that a Carmelite friar made five voyages for y towards the North Pole in the reign of . III., and that one, Macham, an Englishman, ed the island of Madeira, A.D. 1344; but the of their discoveries are not well authenticated. rtain, however, that in the year 1395 some and French adventurers discovered the s, which appears to have been the furthest wards the south-west to which any European ceeded by sea at the close of the fourteenth . At the same time, though the discovery of riner's compass did not lead to any extensive tance with unknown lands, its introduction must have given a great impulse to both navigation and commerce.

The exact state of English shipping during this period is not known; a few facts only having been preserved. Henry III. appears to have had ships of his own, for mention is made of a great ship called the "Queen," which, in the year 1232, he chartered to John Blunchally for life, for an annual payment of fifty marks. Mention is also made of galleys belonging to him at Bristol and in Ireland. It is probable that Edward I. had a more numerous navy, for in the year 1294, when he was making preparations for the invasion of France, he is said to have divided it into three fleets, over each of which he placed an admiral; that title being now first mentioned in English history. Many of these ships, however, were belonging to merchants, and were pressed into the public service for the occasion. The effeminate monarch, Edward II., took no interest in naval affairs, but, like his predecessors, he also had ships of his own; and in his reign the monk of Malmesbury gives the following character of English sailors: "English ships visit every coast; and English sailors excel all others, both in the arts of navigation and in fighting." Their fighting qualities were signally displayed in the reign of Edward III., by a great naval victory obtained over the French at Sluys. That monarch, who appears to have first claimed the dominion of the four seas, had at the siege of Calais, A.D. 1346, a fleet of seven hundred English and thirty-eight foreign ships, and when he invaded France he is said to have possessed eleven hundred. But these great fleets consisted of ships in all the ports of England, which were impressed into the king's service. The Cinque Ports were bound by their charter to have fifty-seven ships in readiness at all times for the king's service; and whenever it was needed, press warrants were issued, by which certain officers were empowered to seize all ships, great and small, not only in the several ports, but all that came in from sea during the continuance of their commission. From an authentic record, it would appear that at the siege of Calais only twenty-five ships belonged to the king: the rest consisting of vessels belonging to English ports and to foreign merchants. The size of the vessels may be imagined from the fact that the complement of each ship on an average amounted only to about twenty-two men. The largest ship of war in England, A.D. 1304, is said to have had a crew of forty men, so that many of the vessels employed in this celebrated siege must have been mere boats in comparison with the men-of-war at the present day. This may be illustrated more fully by a reference to the ships and men supplied from the following ports, and which will also show which were the principal trading towns at this period in the kingdom. Thus, London supplied 25 ships with 662 men; Margate, 15 with 160; Dover, 16 with 336; Sandwich, 22 with 504; Winchelsea, 21 with 596; Weymouth, 20 with 264; Newcastle, 17 with 414; Hull, 16 with 466; Grimsby, 11 with 171; Exmouth, 10 with 193; Dartmouth, 31 with 757; Plymouth, 26 with 603; Looe, 20 with 325; Fowey, 47 with 170; Bristol, 24 with 608; Shoreham, 20 with 329; Southampton, 21 with 572; Lynne, 16 with 482; Yarmouth, 43 with 1095; Gosport, 13

with 103; Harwich, 14 with 283; Ipswich, 12 with 239; and Boston, 17 with 361. Some ships, however, must have been built about this time of larger dimensions, for in the year 1360, Edward ordered that the largest should carry 40 mariners, 40 armed men, and 60 archers; a crew amounting altogether to 140 men.

It would appear that Scotland, now so renowned for ship-building, had some reputation even at this period. According to Matthew Paris, one of the great ships that accompanied St. Louis on his first crusade, A.D. 1249, was built at Inverness; and he calls it for its magnitude, and perhaps power of sailing, "a wonderful ship." That Scotland possessed many ships in this age is clear, for in the reign of Edward III. that country made considerable naval exertions in its wars with that monarch. Thus, in the year 1336, a numerous fleet attacked Guernsey and Jersey, and captured several English vessels off the Isle of Wight; and on more than one occasion Scottish privateers made reprisals on the coasts of England. Some of their ships were of considerable magnitude for the age; for three ships of war captured at Yarmouth, A.D. 1357, to which place they had been driven by the equinoctial gales, are said to have been manned with three hundred armed men. But like those of England, the fleets of Scotland appear to have belonged chiefly to merchants; although Fordun relates that the maritime vassals of the Scottish kings were bound to contribute vessels when needed, in proportion to their lands. Thus, in the reign of Alexander III., the king of Man had to furnish his liege lord with five galleys of twenty-four and five of twelve oars, whenever they were required.

CHAPTER VI.

History of Manners and Customs, from A.D. 1216 to A.D. 1399.

THE national character of the English during this period is variously portrayed by contemporary writers. In the year 1267, the people are represented as having, through the recent civil wars, lost all sense of distinction between right and wrong, virtue and vice; everyone doing whatever seemed good in his own eyes. Valour has ever been an undeniable trait in the English character, and yet after their defeat by the Scots at Bannockburn, A.D. 1314, Malmesbury, in his Life of Edward II., would have us believe that the people became cowards. Other historians bear the same testimony; and Walsingham goes so far as to assert that a hundred English would, for some time after that disaster, take to flight at the approach of two or three Scotchmen. In the same reign, the monk of Malmesbury paints his countrymen in the blackest colours. At court every one swelled with rancour; scorning to cast a look on his inferiors, disdaining his equals, and proudly rivalling his superiors; while the man who was not worth a halfpenny dared to despise those above him, and to return curse for curse. The querulous monk adds, if he might be permitted to speak the truth, the English at that time exceeded all other nations in these three vices:—perjury, pride, and dishonesty. The honest old chronicler, Froissart, does not draw a very flattering picture of the English, for while he does justice to their valour, he represents them after the battle of Poictiers as being so proud and haughty that they would not even be civil to the people of other nations. As for the clergy, they came under the lash of satire in the fourteenth century for their numerous vices, and especially in the poems of Chaucer. In his 'Ploughman's Tale' he represents them as addicted to every vice of which human nature can be guilty. That tale, indeed, is one continued invective against the clergy, and it may be gathered from other writers that they richly deserved the poet's castigation. The dissolute conduct of the clergy throughout all christendom was so glaring, that it gave rise to a general opinion that the times of Antichrist were approaching. Towards the close of the fourteenth century, Wycliffe in England, and others on the continent, affirmed that Antichrist existed in the person of the Pope. Yet all were not corrupt, for Chaucer has left us the picture of a good parish priest, who feared "no rain, no thunder," in visiting his little flock, and who cared not for pomp or reverence,

> "But Christe's lore, and his apostles twelve,
> He taught—but first he followed it himselve."

Social life in England assumed during this period a refinement and splendour hitherto unknown. During the inglorious reigns of King John and Henry III., chivalry declined in England; but under the energetic rule of Edward I. it again revived. That prince was one of the most accomplished knights of the age in which he lived: the feats of chivalry were his delight. If the pages of Froissart may be taken for our guide, it was during the reign of Edward III. that the chivalrous spirit attained its highest exaltation. Chivalry was encouraged in his reign both by his example and munificence. It was by its influence that he sought to accomplish his vast designs. Having formed the design of asserting his claim to the crown of France, he celebrated several tournaments in great pomp, to which knights from all countries were invited and entertained with boundless hospitality. Those who excelled in these martial sports, whether native or foreign knights, were at once loaded with honours and rewards, by which means every tournament he held increased the number of his supporters and considerably added to his strength. The same course was adopted by his rival, Philip of Valois; so that a rivalry of pageants was kept up between them. Edward established the Round Table at Windsor, before his in-

France, to which he summoned illustrious
rom all quarters to feast; and Philip esta-
ae at Paris, by which he intercepted many
nd Italian knights who had accepted his
itation. After that invasion, and his great
Cressy, in order to associate its memory
ostentation of chivalry, Edward solemnly
d the statutes of the Order of the Garter;
Edward the Black Prince, being the first
d all the first companions being men famous
eats of arms in tournaments and the battle-
gend connects the emblem of this order with
ld by Froissart; namely, that King Edward
mours with the countess of Salisbury," who
isted his unhallowed passion, whence when
picked up the garter of her whose "fresh
d goodly demeanour" were ever in his re-
e, he adopted the motto, "Evil be to him
thinks" as the motto of the Order of the
The "Black Book" of the Order, written in
of Henry VIII., says that St. George, the
dragon slayer and virgin deliverer, who
adopted by the crusaders as their patron
ired the Lion-hearted Richard in a dream
a leather on the legs of each of his favourite
and that, therefore, Edward made the
badge of his knightly order—a symbol of
in chivalry. The ceremonies of installa-
performed in the chapel of St. George, at
whither the king and twenty-five com-
all clothed in mantles of fine woollen cloth
our, powdered with garters, and each wear-
reat collar of the order," went in solemn

y was the fruitful parent of opposite effects;
e hand it produced heroic daring and gene-
, and on the other whimsical extravagances
and revolting atrocities. Many of the most magnificent tournaments of the age were designed for the honour and entertainment of the ladies. The beauty and virtue of the ladies, indeed, was often made the occasion of tournaments; knights challenging all who dared to dispute that superiority in those whom they loved, to meet them at a certain time and place to determine the controversy by combat. And this romantic gallantry displayed itself in times of war as well as peace. Knights fought as much for the honour of their mistresses as of their country. It is related that when the English and French met near Cherbourg, A.D. 1379, and were preparing for battle, a French knight exclaimed aloud that he had a more beautiful mistress than any Englishman, which caused a "passage of arms" between him and Sir John Copeland, who denied the fact, in which the Frenchman was slain. Froissart also relates that when Edward raised a great army to assert his claim to the crown of France, many of his knights wore a patch on one eye, under a vow that they would not take it off till they had performed some notable exploit worthy of their mistresses; and these gentlemen, he adds, were much admired.

The nature and general form of the tournament have been described in the previous period. The spectacle, however, in this age became unusually magnificent. A brief description of that held in London, A.D. 1389, may be given as an example. There had recently been a famous tournament held at Paris at the entry of Isabel, queen of France; and Richard II., with his three uncles and great barons, resolved to hold one of equal splendour. Heralds were sent to every country in Europe were chivalry was honoured, to proclaim the time, place, and occasion; and brave knights were invited to honour it with their presence. That invitation was universally accepted. London became thronged with warriors, native and foreign. The lists were erected at Smithfield, then without the walls of the city, which was surrounded with temporary chambers and pavilions, constructed for the king and the princes, the queen, and the maidens of her court. It was on the first Sunday in October that the solemnity commenced. Sixty horses, richly accoutred, were led from the Tower to the lists by squires, accompanied by heralds and minstrels; after which sixty ladies came riding on palfreys, each leading a knight in full armour by a silver chain. It was with the lance that the games commenced; and at evening, when the trials had closed, the two most skilful combatants

TOURNAMENT.

received their rewards, one having a crown of gold presented to him, and the other a rich girdle adorned with gold and precious stones. The night was spent in feasting and dancing, and for five successive days and nights the same solemnities and revelry continued. Nor did they end then, for on Saturday the whole cavalcade rode down to Windsor, where the jousts and feastings continued for several days longer; after which, says Froissart, the king having presented the foreign ladies, lords, and knights with valuable gifts, they returned home well pleased with their entertainment.

The splendour and recklessness of expense, encouraged by chivalry, was not confined to its solemnities. There was unbounded hospitality displayed in the palaces of princes and the castles of the barons. It was still the fashion to maintain large retinues, such as encumbered the march of Henry II. According to the monk of Malmesbury, every one endeavoured to outshine not only his equals but his superiors. Prodigality was the order of the day. As regards large retinues, an excuse may be made for some of them, from the circumstance that England was still infested by bands of robbers: bands not merely strong enough to plunder peaceful cardinals and bishops, but powerful barons, and still more powerful princes. On the other hand, in some instances, the numerous retainers of barons were maintained from sheer ambition, either to enable them to contest with the crown, or to supplant each other. But for whatever purpose they were kept, whether for ostentation, protection, or ambitious designs, it is certain that their maintenance was very costly. The records of household expenditure of kings, prelates, and barons, are such that almost stagger belief. It is on record that Richard II. entertained ten thousand persons daily at his tables; and from an account of the household expenses of the rich and powerful earl of Lancaster it would appear that in one year—1313—he expended about twenty-two thousand pounds of silver, equal to about 110,000*l.* of present money. It was in vain that in the reigns of Edward II. and III. sumptuary laws were made to restrain extravagant feastings: even in times of famine prelates and barons would eat, drink, and make merry, regardless of the poor that were perishing around them. If they were profuse at such times, it may be concluded that they were much more so in times of abundance. At the coronation of kings, the installation of prelates, the marriages of great barons, and at festivals, the number of dishes served up, and the guests entertained, sometimes amounted to several thousands. For instance, at the marriage banquet of Richard, earl of Cornwall, there were thirty thousand dishes; and at the installation of Ralph, abbot of St. Augustine, Canterbury, there were six thousand guests and three thousand dishes served up for their entertainment. As for the banquet given at the nuptials of Alexander III. and the Princess Margaret of England, which were solemnized at York in 1251, Matthew Paris says that if he attempted to display all its grandeur—the numbers of the illustrious guests, the gorgeousness of their dresses, the sumptuousness of the feasts, and the multitudes of minstrels and mimics who were there to divert the company—his readers would think that he was imposing upon their credulity. As an illustration, however, he adds that the archbishop of York made King Edward a present of sixty fat oxen, which were all consumed at the entertainment. Even in ordinary life there was no lack of good fare at the tables of the great. In the Household Roll of Swin-

INVITING TO A FEAST.

SAYING GRACE.

field, bishop of Hereford, it is recorded that in one of his preaching journeys, A.D. 1289, he spent his Christmas-day at his manor-house of Prestbury, on which festival there were served up on his tables two carcases and three quarters of beef, with calves, does, pigs, fowls, bread, and cheese. There were also ten sectaries of red and one of white wine, and an abundance of ale from a recent brewing. The total cost of the bishop's dinner was 4*l.* 16*s.* 3½*d.*, or about one hundred pounds of present money.

Nominally there were still only two meals a day, but in reality there was feasting at intervals all day long. It was at this period that intermeats were introduced; that is, delicate and light dishes were served up between the courses, and designed probably as provocatives for the more substantial viands. The poet Chaucer complains in the 'Parson's Tale' of the artificial cookery which prevailed in his day. Some of the dishes, he intimates, were so highly seasoned

t they were "burning with wild fire," while ers, made to please the eye as well as to gratify taste, were "painted and castelled with paper." ording to Chaucer, the pilgrims he celebrates in 'Canterbury Tales' had a cook with them of no an proficiency in the art of cookery. He writes:—

"A coke thei hadde with them for the nones,
To boyle the chickens and the marie-bones,
And pouder marchaunt, tarte, and galengale;
Well couth he know a draught of London ale.
He couth roste, boile, grille, and frie,
And make mortries, and well bake a pie.
For blank manger that made he with the best."

DINING-ROOM AND KITCHEN.

single pound for eightpence in the provincial town of Ross, within his own diocese. According to the Household Roll of this remarkable bishop, who had risen to his high rank from a humble beginning, saffron was an indispensable article of cookery in his times, for he had a tub for its special reception. As for his salting tubs, they must have been numerous. While at his manor-house of Bosbury in the Martinmas season, his Household Rolls show that fifty-two beeves and a large number of sheep, swine, and even deer, were salted down for consumption during the winter: a season when little fresh meat could be produced by ancient agricultural economy.

Equal extravagance was displayed in the costume of this period as in the feasting and entertainments. It formed a perpetual subject of popular outcry against the great; and the illuminations in contemporary manuscripts show that it was not without foundation, especially as regards the foreign and extravagant fashions which were prevalent. A Latin 'Song upon the Tailors,' written in the reign of Henry III., commences thus: "I have said ye are gods; why should I omit the service which should be said on festival days? Gods certainly ye are who can transform an old garment into the shape of a new one. The cloth, while fresh and new, is made either a cape or mantle, but in order of time, first it is a cape, after a little space this is transformed into the other; thus ye change bodies. When it becomes old, the collar is cut off; when deprived of a collar, it is made a mantle; thus in the manner of Proteus are garments changed. When at length winter returns, many engraft upon the cape a capuce; then it is squared; after being squared it is rounded, and so it becomes an amice. If there remain any morsels of the cloth or skin which is cut, they do not want a use, of these are made gloves. This is the general manner, they all make one robe out of another, English, German, French, and Normans, with scarcely one exception." The civil costume in the reign of Henry III. was similar to that of the two preceding reigns. Robes and mantles continued to distinguish the higher orders, the materials of which were of the most costly description; some mantles being now for the first time lined with ermine. Matthew Paris says that at the marriage of Alexander III., king of Scotland, and Margaret, Henry's eldest daughter, in the year 1251, the king was attended by a thousand knights dressed in silk robes called wintoises, and that on the next day they appeared in new dresses no less splendid and expensive. In the female dress of this reign the principal change was in the fashion of wearing the hair. Instead of being plaited as previously, it was turned up behind and enclosed in a caul of net-work composed of gold, silver, or silk thread, over which the veil was worn. Matrons and

common drinks at this period were ale and er, but there were great quantities of wine of ious kinds imported. Some of the wines, as hippo-s, pigment, and claret, were compounded of wine, ey, and various kinds of spices; the imported es came from Greece, France, Spain, and Syria. ording to Froissart, it was usual in his day for sons of high rank to partake of what was called es; that is, delicate cakes and wine warmed and ed with certain spices before they retired to rest; . he bears testimony that these wines had greatly tributed to his comfort and repose. Sometimes se wines were taken during the day, and especially the arrival of a visitor. In seasoning them, as l as all other inflammable dainties, a plentiful use s made of ginger, cloves, grein de Paris, and norice. Bishop Swinfield's spice-box had been well d with cloves, mace, cinnamon, ginger, pepper, amin, aniseed, and coriander, in preparation for his ristmas dinner at Prestbury; and to these were led sugar, which the crusades had introduced into rope. Sugar appears to have been in common use the close of the thirteenth century, for on one asion the bishop's factor purchased one hundred nds in London; and on another he bought a

widows, however, still wore the wimple or head-kerchief; but it was greatly increased in size, and rendered still more unbecoming by the use of a neck-cloth called the gorget, which was wrapped two or three times round the neck, and fastened above the ears on either side of the face with pins.

In the reign of Edward I. there was a greater simplicity of costume. That monarch is said to have declared it was not possible to add to or diminish real worth by outward apparel, and he enforced his remark by dressing in a manner differing but little from a common citizen. His queen, Berengaria, also appears to have dressed with remarkable simplicity. Her effigy exhibits a dress utterly devoid of ornament. The dress consisted of a long gown with a loose sleeve, beneath which was the usual under-garment tight to the wrist, and a long mantle secured over the breast by a narrow band, and held in the left hand, the folds falling down and enveloping the feet. The general male costume of this reign was a long gown, reaching to the heels and fastened round the waist, or a tunic coming down to the knee, with wide sleeves descending down to the elbow; the tight sleeves of the under tunic reaching to the wrist and confined by a row of buttons generally set close together from the elbow to the wrist, a capacious hood and close-fitting boots, or tight stockings, often richly embroidered, and shoes. The lady's costume of the reign of Edward I. was obnoxious to the satirists of the period, from the unnecessary amount of stuff that was used in their robes, they being so fashioned as to trail along the ground. Their whimsical head-tires, also, were attacked by the satirists. One writer was so ungallant as to compare the ladies to pies and peacocks, their long tails trailing in the dirt "a thousand times longer than those of such birds."

LADIES' COSTUME, EDWARD I.

The Household Roll of Bishop Swinfield affords a glimpse of the character and cost of dress at this period, as regards his own and followers' wardrobes. While in London he bought four pieces of coarse cloth called keyneth, for himself and his clerks, which cost 19*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, which were made up into long garments by a tailor in his establishment. His squires and bailiffs had four pieces and six yards of striped cloth bought for them at a cost of 14*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*; and his grooms and pages had a still commoner sort, which cost 8*l.* 15*s.* 9*d.* Altogether the cloth bought for himself and his household cost more than fifty pounds, about seven hundred and fifty pounds of present money. But this was not all the expense of clothing for his establishment. He had expensive furs to mark his rank. He had hoods of minever, and mantles trimmed with the same costly material. The chaplains had also valuable fur trimmings, but the squires and lay clerks wore lamb-skin clothing. This was in the winter, while travelling in the midst of the bleak Hereford hills; but on the approach of summer, cloths of lighter texture, denominated bluett and russett, were purchased, the bishop and his clerks still wearing the same quality of stuff, and the servants being again distinguished by their striped dresses. The cloth was all made of wool, whether worn in summer or winter, the difference consisting only in the texture.

In the reign of Edward II., a great change in dress originated. That change chiefly appeared at court, but the luxuriant taste, of which Piers Gaveston was the principal promoter, became subsequently very generally diffused. It was in that reign that party-coloured habits came into fashion; and that the sleeves of the surcoat, or super-tunic, terminated at the elbow in tippets or lappets. The capuchon, or cowl, also became twisted and folded into fanciful shapes, the wearer bearing it but little more than balanced on the head. Shoes were generally worn reaching to the ankles, with pointed toes, and slightly ornamented. It was, however, in the

MALE COSTUME, EDWARD II.

reign of Edward III. that the display in costume, which commenced in the reign of his unfortunate father, was fully developed. That reign presents us with an entire change of costume. Gentlemen now wore a close-fitting tunic called a *cote-hardie*, with tight sleeves, and considerably shorter than the dresses worn during the previous reign. It was buttoned down the front, and was composed of the richest material, and magnificently embroidered. Sometimes they were party-coloured, and the sleeves occasionally terminated at the elbow, from which depended the tippets, or streamers, which generally reached from the elbow to the knee, or even lower. Fairholt, in describing the ordinary costume of a

gentleman of the day, from an illumination, says, 'His hair, which during this period was generally nt close over the forehead, and allowed to flow at the ides, encircling the shoulders, is luxuriant. His ood embraces the neck, and hangs behind; it is of rimson. His tightly-fitting cote-hardie of dark blue s encircled at the hips by an elegantly-ornamented irdle, which is never represented, either on male or emale figures, as encompassing the waist, and is enerally divided into a series of square compartments, exhibiting ornamental patterns, many of hich are of great beauty: a small dagger, or anelace, hangs from the girdle. The right stocking is hite, the left one red, and the shoes are open at the step, and fastened round the ankle." The mantles orn over the cote-hardie were very long, and fasned upon the right shoulder by several large ttons. Those worn on state occasions had their ges indented, or cut in the form of leaves, in an borate and sometimes elegant manner. Ladies, e the men, wore the cote-hardie, with the long hite tippets streaming from the elbows. But the st characteristic dress of this period is thus deribed by Fairholt, from the effigy of Blanch de la ur, daughter of Edward III., in Westminster bey: "The lady has her hair arranged in square aits at the sides of the head; a band ornamented th jewels encircles the forehead; her tight-fitting wn is plain and unornamented, hanging in folds er the feet; long streamers fall from the upper part the arm to the ankles, and the hands are placed in ckets, which now begin to appear in ladies' dresses, d into which they are most generally thrust, in the nner that a modern French girl places hers in the ckets of her apron."

According to a monk of Glastonbury, however, the stume of Englishmen in this reign greatly varied. They haunted," he says, "so much unto the folly of angers, that every year they changed them in vers shapes and disguisings of clothing—now long, w large, now wide, now strait—and every day things new and destitute and divest of all honesty old array, or good usages; and another time to ort clothes, and so strait-waisted, with full sleeves d tippets of surcoats, and of hoods over long and rge, all so nagged and knib on every side, and all shattered, and all so buttoned, that they seemed ore like to tormentors in their clothing, and also in eir shoeing and other array, than they seemed to be e men."

But it was during the reign of Richard II. that stume became greatly distinguished for its varieties. is grandfather's parliament had found it necessary to ake sumptuary laws for regulating the dress of all nks of people, in order, as the preamble to these ws set forth, "to prevent that destruction and verty with which the kingdom was threatened by e excessive expenses of many persons in their parel, above their ranks and fortunes." These laws d but little effect during the reign of Edward III., d when his grandson came to the throne, they were rown to the winds. The freaks of ever-changing shion became as varied as the whim and extravance of the many courtiers who thronged the palace the king. Richard himself was the prince of fops. No bounds were set to his extravagance in clothing. Holinshed says he had a cote-hardie made of gold and stone, which was valued at thirty thousand marks, or twenty thousand pounds present money. His portrait in the Jerusalem Chamber well illustrates his gorgeous attire. His dalmatic is embroidered all over with roses and the letter R.; his robe is lined with ermine, having a deep collar of the same material covering the shoulders, and is fastened round the neck by a band and clasp of the most costly jewelled ornaments. His shoes are also richly embroidered and set with stones; and his crown, sceptre, and orb are very elegant and splendid. With such an example before them, his courtiers, and people of all classes, became smitten with the love of finery. It became the fashion of embroidering the dress with heraldic devices, family badges, or initial letters of the name and mottoes used by the wearer. Harding, in his Chronicle, says that every man was desirous to surpass his fellows in "costly clothing of silk, satin, and damask," and he adds that "they never troubled themselves about the payment of their fine attire. Array so rich, costly, and precious, had never before been known in England."

It would be impossible to narrate all the varieties of costume introduced during this reign, and the best illustration that can be given of it as regards the dress of the different grades in English society has thus been aptly condensed by Fairholt from Chaucer's celebrated "Canterbury Tales:" "The young squire was dressed in a short gown, with sleeves long and wide, embroidered all over with white and red flowers, and his hair was as carefully curled as if each lock had been laid in a press. The yeoman was clad in a coat and hood of green, with a horn slung across his shoulders by a green baldrick, like a good forester. Under his belt was fixed a sheaf of arrows tipped with peacock's feathers, a sword and buckler on one side, and a 'gay dagger' on the other. In one hand he bore a bow, and upon his arm a gay bracer; while a figure of St. Christopher, his patron saint, ornamented his breast. The merchant had a forked beard, and was arrayed in a party-coloured or motley dress: he wore a hat of Flanders beaver; and his shoes were 'clasped fair and fetously.' The frankelein, or country gentleman, is described as wearing at his girdle an anelace and gipciere; that is, a dagger and purse. The haberdasher, carpenter, weaver, dyer, and tapestry-worker, were clothed in the livery of their various companies, their pouches, girdles, and knives wrought with silver, and 'not with brass.' The shipman was habited in a gown of 'falding,' or coarse cloth, reaching to the knee, a dagger hung under his arm by a lace passing round his neck. The poor ploughman wore a sleeveless tabard, a jacket, or sleeveless coat. The miller had a beard as broad as a spade, and wore a white coat and blue hood, with a sword and buckler by his side. The reeve, or steward, had his beard close-shaved, and his hair cut close round the ears, and at the top of his head, like a priest; and he wore a long surcoat of 'perse,' a sky-coloured, or bluish-grey cloth, which was tucked, like a friar's gown about him, and carried a rusty blade by his side.

"Of the ladies we may notice the wife of Bath,

whose costume may be taken as a good example of that of the other classes of the commonalty. She wore kerchiefs on her head of fine cloth, upon Sundays, that 'weighed a pound;' scarlet hose, with moist new shoes. Her travelling dress was a wimple, a hat as broad as a buckler or target, and a mantle. In the course of the tales many other illustrations of costume occur, and that of the carpenter's wife in the 'Miller's Tale,' may be cited as an instance. She wore a girdle 'barred of all silk,' a white 'barme-cloth,' or apron, full of gores, broidered before and behind with black silk, and fastened by a brooch as big as the boss of a buckler. Upon her head she wore a white 'volupere,' or cap tied with tapes, and a broad silk fillet round her head. At her girdle hung her leather purse, ornamented with metal buttons and silk tassels; her shoes were laced high upon her legs."

An English beau of the fourteenth century exhibited a fantastical and even grotesque appearance. He wore long, pointed shoes, fastened to his knees by gold or silver chains; hose of one colour on one leg, and of another colour on the other; short breeches, which did not reach to the middle of his thighs, and disclosed the shape of all the parts included in them; a coat, one half white, and the other half black or blue; a long beard; a silk hood buttoned under his chin, embroidered with grotesque figures of animals, dancing men, &c., and sometimes ornamented with gold, silver, and precious stones. Nor was the dress

MALE COSTUME, RICHARD II.

of fashionable ladies more decent or becoming. Knyghton says that the tournaments were attended "by many ladies of the first rank and greatest beauty, but not always of the most untainted reputation. These ladies dressed in parti-coloured tunics, one-half being of one colour, and the other half of another; their lirripipes, or tippets, were very short; their caps remarkably small, and wrapped about their heads with cords; their girdles or pouches were ornamented with gold and silver, and they wore short swords, called daggers, before them, a little below their navels." The head-dresses of the ladies underwent numerous changes during the period, the most remarkable being that which was worn nearly three feet above the head, in the shape of a sugar-loaf, with streamers of fine silk flowing from the top of them down to the ground.

FEMALE COSTUME, RICHARD II.

LADIES HEAD-DRESSES.

Some of the clergy were not behindhand with satirists in condemning the costliness of appare this period. Yet of all the costumes worn, none more splendid than that worn by ecclesiastics. T

CARDINALS' HATS.

vestments were richly embroidered with figures flowers and other ornaments of the most elabor workmanship, and the borders were sometimes with precious stones, while the mitres and crosiers the dignitaries of the Church were enriched with t most exquisite inventions of the goldsmith and jew ler. Chaucer gives much curious information up clerical costume. His monk, in the "Canterbury P grimage," is luxuriantly habited. Thus his slee

re "purfiled" or bordered at the hand with the est "gris," or costly fur of the gray, or marten :—

And for to fasten his hood under his chin
He had of gold ywrought a curious pin.

s parish clerk, Absolon, also in the "Miller's Tale," richly dressed in red hose, a sky-blue kirtle ornanted with points, or tags, and over all, a white plice, with "Paule's windows carven on his shoes," at is, they were cut or embroidered like Gothic ndows. Chaucer's ploughman rails at the clergy unmeasured terms for their almost regal luxuriance. declared that they rode high horses :—

In glittering gold of grete arraie
Painted and portrid all in pride;
No common Knight may go so gay,
Change of clothing every day;
With golden girdles great and small.

ny of them, he says, had more than a couple of tres, ornamented with pearls, like the head of a en, and pastoral staffs of gold set with jewels as vy as if they were made of lead. He says,—

They be so rooted in riches
That Christ's poverty is forgot

that,—

Some wear a miter and ring,
With double worsted well dressed;
With royall mete and rich drinke;
And ride on coursers as a Knight,
With hawkes and with hounds eke
With brooch or ouches on his head.

speaks of the monks, also, when out of church, ing in dances and sports, dressed in gowns of let or green, shaped after the newest fashion, and into ornaments at the edges like those of the r, and even appearing with

Bucklers broad, and swords long,
Baudrick, with baselards keur,
Such tools about their necks they hong.

s Plowman is equally bitter in his complaints of pride of the clergy. He represents Antichrist as g accompanied by above a hundred proud priests, ited in paltocks, or short jackets worn by the r, with peaked shoes and large knives or daggers. lards, or ornamented daggers, were strictly forlen to be worn by priests; and in Piers Plowman's sion" the propriety of priests carrying their beads books instead of these weapons, is thus insisted —

But if many a preest bare,
For their baselards and their brooches,
A pair of beads in their hand,
And a book under their arm.
Sire John and Sire Geffrey
Hath a girdle of silver,
A baselard, or a ballok-knyf
With botons over gilte.

before seen, various orders of monks were estaied in England at this period. All these orders pt two were finally suppressed. These were the nelites, or White Friars, and the Augustines, who also known, as well as Franciscans, by the name hrey Friars, from the colour of their cloaks. At these monks came in the garb of mendicants; but the Franciscans, at least, became noted for pride in dress. In the "Creed" of Piers Plowman their pride is thus denounced by the Augustine friar, whose costume we may presume was of a humbler character :—

In coting of their copes
Is more cloth folded
Than was in St. Francis' frock,
When he them first made;
And yet under that cope
A cote hath he furred
With foyns or with fitchens,
Or else with fine beaver;
And that is cutted to the knee
And quaintly buttoned,
Lest any spiritual man
Espy that guile.
Francis had his brethren
Barefoot to walk;
Now have they buckled shoes,
Lest they hurt their heels;
And hose in hard weather
Fastened at the ankle.

MOURNING HABITS, 1337.

As regards the armour of this period, it varied in different reigns. In that of Henry III. there was an admixture of plate with the various sorts of mail worn from the time of the Conquest, the plate being confined to caps for the knees and protections for the elbows and shoulders. Chain mail was also introduced in this reign from Asia. A helmet of a barrel form, with an aperture for sight cut in the transverse bar of a cross, covered the head; and skull-caps of various forms were worn by men-at-arms and esquires. Although Edward I. was regardless of personal finery in his civil attire, he encouraged a taste for splendour and display amongst his knights and men-at-arms who accompanied him in his wars. Their banners, shields, surcoats, and even the housings of their horses, were emblazoned with armorial bearings. Their war-helmets were also surmounted by heraldic crests. Towards the close of his reign it became usual to have a pair of plates fastened to the shoulders of different shapes, all of which were either emblazoned with heraldic devices, or with the plain cross of St. George. These went out of fashion in the next reign, which was chiefly distinguished for the increase of plate armour. Greaves were now worn in front of the legs, and brassarts and vambraces from the shoulder to the elbow, sometimes in a single

piece, and sometimes in a series of overlapping plates. Two round plates were likewise fastened on the breast, from whence chains depended, to which the helmet and the sword were attached. In the reign of Edward III. plate armour almost superseded the ancient chain mail. The legs, arms, and feet were defended by steel plates; and even the knuckles had small spikes, knobs, and other ornaments placed on them for defence. In this reign, also, a breastplate called a plastron came into use, its design being to keep the chain shirt, divested of its sleeves, from pressing on the chest. The surcoat was also discarded, and an upper garment, called a gipon, which was a tight-fitting vest made of velvet, and richly embroidered with the arms of the wearer, substituted. Chaucer makes mention of this in his Knight's Tale, thus:—

> With him there wenten Knightes many a one;
> Some wol ben armed in an habergeon,
> And in a breast-plate and in a gipon.

In his "Canterbury Tales" he mentions it under the name of jupon, by which it was also known—

> —— A jupon
> All besmotred with his habergeon;

that is, his jupon was stained with his coat of mail. Very little alteration was made in military costume in the reign of Richard II. The most remarkable change was that of a moveable vizor being attached to the bascinet, which was a light helmet-shaped skull-cap, at this time always used in war; the ponderous helmet being only worn in the joust and tournament. Light helmets were worn in the three last reigns of this period by the English infantry. The bascinet had been worn by Richard Cœur de Lion; for in Weber's romance of the renowned Crusader, we are told that a Saracen knight gave Richard a "sorry flatt" or blow—

> That foundryd bacynet and hat.



SHIELD OF JOHN OF GAUNT.

Of the domestic furniture of this period the beds of the nobility were lavishly adorned. In form they were a mere railed box or crib, but the rails were of costly material, and the draperies at the head magnificent in substance and in armorial blazonry. Some

BED.

beds are mentioned powdered with blue eagles and of red velvet, with ostrich feathers of silver, and heads of leopards of gold; others of black velvet, black satin, and blue, red, and white silk. Cloth of gold and silver coverlets, and rich fur of ermines are also mentioned, as are sheets of fair white silk, and pillows from the East. Carpets of silk are specified in this age, all "paynted and embroidered with images of gold." In the thirteenth century the square back chair was frequent in mansions; but in the fourteenth, chairs and other articles were modified by the Pointed architecture. In wealthy families the most valuable article of furniture was the plate, which consisted chiefly of bowls, flagons, and cups of silver or gold. Knives were carried by the men, who at the table first cut their own meat and then served the females. Forks were still unknown; and it seems to have formed a part of the education of females for the schoolmistress to teach them how to use their fingers at meals.

Mention is made in this period of reading-desks;

LIBRARY CHAIR.

there are repeated notices of silver, and silver-plate, consisting of dishes, basins, ewers, chargers, cellars, and silver spoons. The use of dishes, es, saucers, and jugs of earthenware was not mon in England in the fourteenth century; but a are mentioned in the Household Roll of Bishop nfield. He laid in large stores of crockery-ware le in London; and jugs and dishes appear to have a expensive articles in his establishment, for there constant entries of new purchases. The fragile asils were moved about from place to place in pany with the iron and brass vessels of the hen; and in rutty roads, where the cart was every and then overturned, the breakage must have a considerable. It may seem strange that the l bishop should have carried these things about h him as he travelled from manor-house to manor-se; but the inventories of the period prove that e was a scarcity of articles of furniture in this even among the wealthy. They might own ral castles and country residences, but it seems r that few had furniture more than sufficient to ish one; for when they removed from place to e their tables, beds, plate, and articles of every l, were carted with them. To have endured such tant removals in times of rutty roads, the furni- must have been made of very strong material; it would appear that in some cases, as in the neyings of Bishop Swinfield, tables and tressels, benches of the hall, together with the chest and tead of the private chamber, were made on the by the carpenter.

ie style of living among the wealthy before ibed required vigorous digestion. Hence we that hunting and hawking were sports more ly followed than ever. As many of the restric- in hunting were abolished, the common people, began to indulge in the sport. We find, also, the clergy were strongly attached to "venerie." he reign of Edward III. the bishop of Ely ex- unicated several persons who had stolen one of awks during divine service, and in the reign of ard II. clergymen were prohibited from keeping for hunting if their income did not amount to than ten pounds. Ladies often accompanied emen in hunting-parties, and sometimes they ed hunting-parties of their own. Knyghton that they even rode from castle to castle, and town to town, with poniards in their girdles and ins in their hands, in search of adventure. These s were the chief delight and business of the hy. Froissart relates that some of them kept n hundred dogs for the chase; and we find that p Swinfield left two boys at his manor-house of bury at board wages in the care of his hounds, hich they were paid fourteen shillings and ten- for their month; by no means a low rate of . Royal hunts were occasionally as splendid lmost as expensive as tournaments. Thus in ear 1363, Edward III. proclaimed a royal hunt ich he invited the kings of France, Scotland, Cyprus who were then in England, together all the French hostages and his own nobles. forests, woods, and chases were hunted over on occasion, from which it may be concluded that the sport lasted for a considerable time. The deer was the chief object of sport; but wolves probably were hunted as they were not yet extirpated.

The favourite sports of the common people are mentioned in a proclamation of Edward III., A.D. 1363, in which he prohibits them because they interfered with the exercise of archery. "In former times the people of our kingdom at their hours of play commonly exercised themselves in archery, from which we derived both honour and advantage. But now that art is neglected, and the people spend their time in throwing stones, wood, or iron, in playing at the hand-ball, foot-ball, or club-ball, in bull-baiting and cock-fighting, or in more useless and dishonest games."

ARCHERS.

In this proclamation King Edward had an eye to military glory, for it is evident he considered that the sports particularized were derogatory to the military spirit of the nation. This proclamation was evidently unheeded, for, two years after, another to the same effect was issued. Chaucer mentions wrestling for a ram as common in his time; and Matthew Paris records that in the year 1222 the citizens of London and the inhabitants of Westminster had a famous wrestling-match for one, which terminated in a real battle, in which much blood was shed, and the Londoners were routed.

The indoor amusements of this period were generally those of earlier times, but some few are now first mentioned. The dishonest games mentioned in the proclamations of Edward III. may be understood to refer to games of chance, to which not only the common people, but the higher classes, were addicted. Among these was the game of cross and pile, which appears to have been introduced at court by the frivolous monarch, Edward II. From an account of that period, on one occasion he is said to have repaid Henry, his barber, five shillings which he had lent him to play at cross and pile; and on another eightpence to Robert Watterville, which the said Robert had fairly won of him in a trial of skill at that game. Among the higher classes the game of chess was very prevalent, and towards the close of the period cards are mentioned. In this age mummings, also, were



CIRCULAR CHESS-BOARD.

DRAUGHT-BOARD.

introduced. Judging from the old illuminations, these were a coarse and primitive kind of masquerade, where the actors rather imitated the brute creation than fictitious human characters. At great festivals the whole company sometimes wore masks; and the revellings on these occasions were of the most obscene character. Towards the close of the period the mummings became an attractive amusement to the common people, so much so that Edward III., A.D. 1337, is said to have issued an ordinance against vagrants who exhibited scandalous masquerades in ale-houses, and in which he gave directions that such vagrants should be whipped out of London. At great public banquets, pageants were introduced for the amusement of the guests; and the palaces of princes, and castles of barons, were on such occasions crowded with minstrels, mimics, jugglers, tumblers, and rope-dancers. As for dancing, that was a favourite diversion on all occasions, the highest in rank, and the gravest personages in the realm not disdaining to "trip it on the light fantastic toe." The jester with his bells, and his grotesque cap and bauble, was still an inmate of noble and princely households, his office being to excite the jaded spirits of his lord by jests, either intellectual or practical, and to keep the banqueting-hall in a roar by his wit or buffoonery. Theatrical amusements were still common; but they appear to have been of the same character as the mysteries and miracles described in the former period. They were of a character that reflects no credit either on the taste or the piety of the age. They were founded upon scriptural or religious history; but they were so intermingled with buffoonery as to render them profane in the highest degree. The words comedy and tragedy occur in some authors during this period; but by the former word nothing more is meant than facetious tales, and by the latter, tales of woe adapted to excite terror, grief, and pity. Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales" are, in this sense, comedies and tragedies, for some are of facetious, and others of a mournful character. Thus his "Tale of the Miller" may be regarded as comedy, for he is represented as the very personification of low mirth and churlish humour; and that of the friar represents him as a wanton and merry boon companion. In his poem of "Troilus and Creside," the poet himself has defined what the tragedy of the period was, for the monk, in his prologue to the tale, says:—

> Tragidy is to tell a certain story
> As oldis bok is mak in ofte memory
> Of them that stode in great prosperity,
> And be fallin out of their hie degree
> Into misery.

Accordingly, the seventeen short stories of which this poem or tragedy consists, has but one burden, the descent of some great personage from the heights of prosperity to the lowest depths of adversity.

HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK.

CHAPTER I.

Civil and Military History, from the Accession of Henry IV., A.D. 1399, to the Death of Richard III., A.D. 1485.

HENRY IV. OF BOLINGBROKE.

ʀʏ of Bolingbroke was crowned king of England he 13th of October A.D. 1399, just one year after ad gone into exile. His accession was hailed as a ɔy event for the country; but when parliament sted him with the regal dignity, they performed ıct which led to the most desolating domestic ggle that has marked the English annals—the Wars of the Roses.

he claim which Henry made "in his mother- ue" to the English throne was plausible, but it not just. *He* was not the rightful heir to the ne. His father, John of Gaunt, had two older hers than himself—the Black Prince, whose un- ɔy son had been deposed, and Lionel, duke of ence, who, at his death, left a daughter, Philippa, nherit his possessions and pretensions. Philippa ried Mortimer, earl of March, grandson of that e who was executed for the murder of Edward II. whose forfeited estates had been subsequently ɔred to his family. The issue of this marriage Roger Mortimer, who succeeded to his mother's ts to the crown; and when it was placed on ıry's head at Westminster, the son of Roger Mor- ɛr, Edmund earl of March, was, according to the of hereditary succession, the undoubted heir to throne. His rights, however, were overlooked, Henry was the chosen of the people to sway the lish sceptre.

t the commencement of his reign, parliament was complaisance to King Henry. Lest any claimant ld dispute his rights, his son, afterwards Henry V., created prince of Wales, and declared heir ap- ɪnt to the throne. In legislation the king and his iament. for a brief period, went hand-in-hand. ıe excellent statutes were enacted. Treason was ıced to its limits prior to the insurrection headed Wat Tyler; all the obnoxious measures of the reign were repealed; and the delegation of the ɛr of parliament to a commission was prohibited. ɔcals of treason in parliament, also, were abolished. on this subject violent disputes occurred among barons. Those appeals had been greatly abused, the conduct of the lords who had appealed ucester, Arundel, and Warwick of treason, as ted in a former page, was called into question. fierce was the altercation that the words "liar" "traitor" were freely exchanged, and forty gaunt- lets were thrown upon the floor of the house as pledges of battle in the lists. Henry managed to quell the storm; but in so doing he created many personal enemies, for the result of the dispute was, that the lords appellants were deprived of the honours and estates bestowed upon them for their subser- viency, and, chagrined thereat, they, and others who confederated with them, plotted for his overthrow.

The chief conspirators were the earls of Rutland, Kent, and Huntingdon, and Lord Spenser—who had been degraded from their respective titles of Albe- marle, Surrey, Exeter, and Gloucester—and the earl of Salisbury, and Lord Lumley. Their first design was to kill Henry at a tournament at Oxford; but the earl of Rutland had revealed the plot, and neither he nor the king made their appearance. Feeling that they were betrayed, accompanied by a body of horse the conspirators rode rapidly to Windsor, and sur- prised the castle; but the king was not within its walls. He was gone to London to levy an army to meet the danger. Thus disappointed of their prey, the conspirators marched to the west in separate bands, and proclaimed King Richard, hoping to raise an army in his favour. But the mischief fell upon their own heads. The burghers of Cirencester cap- tured and beheaded the earls of Kent and Surrey; and the citizens of Bristol, equally loyal to King Henry, seized and executed the lords Lumley and Spenser in the same summary manner. Others of the conspirators were taken prisoners and were subse- quently executed under legal judgments; and to put an end to demonstrations in favour of the deposed monarch, it was soon after stated that he had died at Pontefract, and in proof of his death his corpse was sent to London, and exhibited with the face exposed, that all men might see that he was indeed dead.

There were great rejoicings in London at the defeat of this conspiracy. When the quarters of those who had been executed were sent thither, bishops and abbots joined with the populace in exultations over their mangled remains. But the most brutal spectacle was that which was exhibited by the false Rutland. He had been instrumental in the murder of his uncle, the duke of Gloucester; had deserted Richard, by whom he was trusted; had conspired against the life of Henry, to whom he had sworn allegiance; had betrayed his associates, whom he had in reality se- duced into this abortive conspiracy; and, as a climax to his infamy, he now appeared in London, carrying

on a pole the head of Lord Spenser, his brother-in-law, which he presented to the king as a proof of his loyalty! And yet this infamous man was suffered to live; and soon after, on the death of his father, he became duke of York, and first prince of the blood.

The conspiracy was quelled, but Henry's throne was still hedged about with dangers. His reign, to a great extent, is marked with insurrections, which gave him full employment, and severely taxed his ability to suppress them. Nor was it from within his own dominions only that his throne was threatened. A war with France seemed inevitable. The news of the deposition and death of Richard caused a profound sensation in that country. Anxiety for the welfare of his daughter, the child-queen of England, who was by these events left defenceless, had such an effect upon King Charles, that he was seized with a fit of insanity. He had been long subject to mental derangements, and his uncles were more the rulers of France than he was; and, enraged at the intelligence, the duke of Burgundy led an army into Guienne, still in the possession of England; while the duke of Bourbon led another army as far as Agen, to second his enterprise. That enterprise, however, signally failed. The people of Guienne still proved loyal to the throne of England, caring but little who was king so long as their franchises and liberties were preserved to them. No overtures could persuade them to exchange masters; and the king, on recovering his senses for a season, forbade hostilities, his one desire being to have his daughter restored to his parental care. On his part, Henry had no desire for war with France, and after lengthened negotiations, Isabella was carried over to Calais, and delivered to the duke of Burgundy. Henry proposed a marriage between his eldest son and Isabella, but Charles would not listen to the proposition: rather than consent to such an alliance, he received her back again with only her jewels, leaving the sum of two hundred thousand francs of gold, which had been paid to Richard in part of her dower, in the hands of King Henry.

The conquest of Scotland was still a popular idea in England. In order, therefore, to inaugurate his reign with some marked event which would raise him in the estimation of the people, Henry resolved upon an expedition into that country. The time seemed auspicious for such an enterprise. Scotland was at that period in a state of distraction. Its king, Robert, was aged and infirm, and his eldest son, David, was at variance with the chief of the Scottish nobility. Thus encouraged, Henry collected an army under the old system of feudal service, for the invasion of Scotland: the great churchmen contributing a tenth of their incomes towards the support of the enterprise, and the lay lords taking the field with their retainers, at their own charges. This expedition, however, proved fruitless. Henry summoned King Robert and his nobles to meet him at Edinburgh to do him homage: the king for his crown, and the nobles for their estates; but when he reached that city he found it defended, and after a vain attempt to take the castle, he returned to England. Subsequently, in the year 1402, the Scots retaliated by invading Northumberland, but they were defeated at Homildon Hill by the earl of Northumberland and his son, the Hotspur Percy, with great slaughter, and the Scottish general, Earl Douglas, with numerous nobles and knights, were taken prisoners. This victory was achieved by the English archers, whose arrows did fearful execution, the English men-at-arms, with the knights and squires, standing by as spectators of the deadly scene.

At the time of the battle of Homildon Hill, Henry was engaged in a war with the Welsh. The people of Wales had been strongly attached to King Richard, and his deposition gave them mortal offence. In revenge they ravaged the countries bordering on the Marches, carrying away much cattle, and arresting all the merchants that fell in their way. The country was ripe for revolt; and it was hastened by various injudicious and severe enactments passed in parliament by way of retaliation for their forays. It was not only enacted that reprisals upon Welsh property and persons were justifiable, but it was ordained that no Englishman should be convicted at the suit of any Welshman within Wales, except by the judgment of English justices; that no Welshman should be elected in any city or town in England as a citizen or burgess; and that no Welshman should either bear arms or wear armour. These enactments must have been very galling to the brave descendants of the ancient Britons. A leader only was wanting, and private wrongs gave them that leader in the person of one of the most remarkable men of his age —Owen Glendower.

Owen Glendower was a descendant of the ancient princes of Wales, being the great-grandson of Llewellyn. He was educated at one of the inns of court in London, and had been an esquire in the household of King Richard. He was a landowner in Wales, and his property lay contiguous to that of Lord Grey de Ruthyn. Not satisfied with his own broad domains, Lord Grey seized some of Owen Glendower's lands, and the Welsh squire sought redress of parliament. That redress was denied: he was told by the peers, in answer to his petition, that they did not care for "barefooted rascals." Stung to the quick by this gross insult, Glendower returned to Wales, took up arms in self-defence, and recovered his property. King Henry now declared him an outlaw; and Owen boldly replied by declaring himself the prince of Wales; and that declaration was seconded by the voice of the people. Liberty and independence were still dear to that high-souled nation. They flocked to his standard from all quarters. The Welsh students of Oxford and Cambridge threw up their studies, and nearly every Welshman in England, whether merchant, tradesman, or labourer, stole quietly out of the kingdom and betook themselves to their native mountains to fight for Owen Glendower: the spirit of freedom being quickened by the songs of bards, who everywhere attuned their harps in praise of the prince who had arisen to restore the glory of the ancient Britons.

While yet the insurrection was unripe for action, Hotspur Percy and Prince Henry, then only fourteen years of age, were sent against the insurgents. In that year, also, A.D. 1401, Henry himself went into Wales, but their combined operations appear chiefly

) have consisted in burning towns and villages, and esolating some portions of the country. Glendower roved himself to be a cautious and skilful general, lthough he was only a "barefooted rascal;" for he led he English long marches through a difficult and esolate part of the country, from which they were mpelled to retire for want of provisions. Every ay the insurrection gained strength, Glendower's me being heightened by his out-generaling the nglish leaders. And that fame, in the year 1402, as still further increased, while Henry was in otland, by two great victories, in one of which he ok Lord Grey prisoner, and in the other captured r Edmund Mortimer, uncle to the young earl of arch. Thus boldly defied, Henry marched again to Wales, to check "the insolence and malice" of wen Glendower. Advancing from Shrewsbury, he vided his forces into three separate armies, which ured into Wales in as many different quarters. But lendower was nowhere to be found—he was lost in e mountains. He was already, for his learning, garded as a necromancer by his simple countrymen -one who had intercourse with the invisible world of irits. It is related that Henry, while in Wales, me to be of their opinion, though not from the same use. While Glendower was, as it were, in the ouds, there were storms of rain, snow, and hail, hich inundated the valleys, and swept away the nglish tents, and Henry withdrew from his pursuit him, convinced, it is alleged, that he had raised the mpests by his wicked sorcery. When he retreated, lendower came down from the clouds, and marched triumph through the country, every one acknowdging the grandson of the great Llewellyn to be eir true and lawful sovereign.

As soon as it was discovered that Owen Glendower ad become the leader of the Welsh insurrection, the nglish parliament ordained that no Englishman arried to any one of his kin or race should hold any fice either in Wales or in the Marches. In defiance f this enactment, however, Sir Edmund Mortimer, Henry's "beloved cousin," was, during the winter of .D. 1402-3, united to the daughter of the Welsh hieftain, and thereby changed his position from that f a prisoner to the friend and ally of Glendower. his union appears chiefly to have been brought bout by Henry's own impolitic conduct. Of all the obles in England, none had contributed more to lace him on the throne than the Percys of Northumerland. It was the Percys, also, that had been the hief defenders of that throne when the Scots, under Douglas, invaded England. It might have been upposed, therefore, that any favour they might have sked of him in reason would have been freely ranted. He did, indeed, liberally reward the earl of Northumberland by the gift of several broad manors, nd most of the lands in England which had belonged) the earl of Douglas. That was deemed sufficient y him to insure the gratitude and fidelity of the ercys. And so it might had he not touched them in eir natural affections. The wife of Henry Percy as the sister of Edmund Mortimer, and when he was aken prisoner by Owen Glendower, Percy sought ermission of Henry to be allowed to ransom him by e payment of a sum of money to the Welsh chieftain. The request was natural, but it was refused. Henry kept the young earl of March, who was the rightful heir of the throne, in close custody, and his policy was to allow his uncle, Edmund Mortimer, to be retained as a prisoner in Wales. The security of his throne was his first object in all his actions; but by this policy he brought it into imminent danger. Not only did Edmund Mortimer ally himself with Owen Glendower, but the Percys themselves, who now treated Henry as a usurper, drew their swords in favour of the rightful heir—the boy earl of March.

The conspiracy that ensued was one of the most formidable character. The Percys assembled their vassals, and liberated the earl of Douglas without ransom, on condition of his joining them with his forces, while Owen Glendower agreed to co-operate with twelve thousand Welsh. The aid of the kings of France and Scotland, also, was solicited, all feelings of patriotism for their country being swallowed up by those of revenge.

The conspiracy was conducted with the greatest secrecy and despatch. True to his engagement, the earl of Douglas crossed the borders with a considerable force. When the war broke out, the old earl of Northumberland was "sore sick at Berwick," and the command was intrusted to his son, the Hotspur Percy. Hotspur marched towards North Wales to meet the reinforcements of the Welsh, and on his road he was joined by the earl of Worcester, his uncle, with a body of archers from Cheshire. At that time Henry was marching towards the north with an army to join the forces of Northumberland against the Scots. He was at Burton-upon-Trent when he heard the news of the revolt, and he hurried forward to give battle to the rebels. Glendower was on his march from Carmarthenshire to join the confederates, but Henry's rapid movements prevented the union of their forces. The royal troops discovered Hotspur near Shrewsbury. It was evening when the opposing forces came in sight of each other, and the battle was deferred till the morrow. In the meantime the confederates sent Henry a haughty defiance, stating the grounds on which they had taken up arms for his dethronement. Their manifesto upbraided him with the perjury of which he had been guilty, when on his return from exile he had sworn upon the gospels that he had no other intention than to recover the duchy of Lancaster, and that he would ever remain faithful to King Richard; whereas he had first dethroned and then murdered him, and, by the aid of his friends and accomplices, had crowned himself king of the realm. It further accused him of usurping the throne, which at the death of Richard did of right belong to the house of Mortimer; of loading the nation with taxes, although he had sworn upon the gospels that without the utmost necessities he would never levy any impositions on his people; and of procuring by his arts elections in parliament favourable to his usurpation. Finally, it accused him of harsh conduct with regard to Sir Edmund Mortimer, and charged him with seeking the destruction of the Percys because they had entered into negotiation for the release of their kinsman from captivity in Wales without his consent. On all these grounds the manifesto declared Henry perjured and false, the conspirators adding that by

the blessing of God they intended to prove it by deeds of arms. On his part, Henry simply replied that the confederates were false and forsworn traitors, which he would prove by dint of sword and fierce battle, and he doubted not that God would give him the victory.

It was on the morning of the 21st of July that Henry and Hotspur drew out their forces to meet in mortal combat. It was fought at Hartleyfield, about three miles from Shrewsbury, which is a plain of no great extent, having a gentle range of hills rising towards the Welsh border. The armies were nearly equal in numbers, each consisting of about fourteen thousand men. Many years had elapsed since the sons of England had opposed each other in the field of battle, and as the opposing armies gazed at each other, there was a pause of dread at the impending struggle. Henry, whose life and crown depended upon its issue, would fain have stopped the strife: he sent the abbot of Shrewsbury with proposals of an

SHREWSBURY ARMS.

amicable arrangement, but they were scornfully rejected. Then the trumpets blew, and the royalists, crying "Saint George!" and their adversaries, "Esperance, Percy!" the armies joined battle. The Northumbrian archers drew their bowstrings with fatal effect, many of the king's troops were slain, and those who had not fallen recoiled before their well-aimed shafts, and the fierce charge of the men-at-arms led by Hotspur and Douglas. Henry of Monmouth, who had joined his father the day before the battle, was wounded in the face, but he still fought with the rage of a lion. Henry himself fought desperately in the thickest of the battle; and Hotspur and Douglas sustained their high renown. The feats of valour performed by Douglas are almost incredible. His aim was to find and slay the king, and many a knight accoutred in the royal garb was struck down mortally by his powerful arm. Henry himself, who fought in plain armour, was unhorsed by him, but he was raised, and again rushed into the thickest of the fight. For three hours the field was contested with the fiercest obstinancy on both sides. Victory trembled in the balance, but it was at length decided by one single arrow. That arrow pierced Hotspur's brain, and when he fell, panic and terror seized the hearts of his followers. The Welsh fled to the hills; the gallant Douglas, with the earl of Worcester, the baron of Kinderton, and Sir Richard Vernon, with others of less note, were taken prisoners, and the battle was over. The slaughter was fearful, few or none of the Scots escaped, and of the twenty-eight thousand who thus met in mortal combat, half were either slain or wounded. Douglas was treated as a foreign knight, and entertained kindly, but Worcester, Kinderton, and Vernon were beheaded as rebels on the field of battle. The old earl of Northumberland was marching with his retainers through Durham, when he heard of the issue of the battle of Shrewsbury, and he fled to his castle of Warkworth; but he was compelled to surrender himself into the king's hands at York. He made his peace with Henry, who allowed him to escape even without a forfeiture.

It was not only Hotspur Percy and the confederates who charged Henry with the murder of King Richard. It was the popular belief both in France and England for many years; and by what means he died still remains a mystery. Henry himself treated the tale as calumny. The duke of Orleans having in a letter addressed to Henry, A.D. 1403, insinuated that he was guilty of the murder; and in reply he called God to witness that he was innocent of the crime, and offered to meet him in single combat to prove his innocence. Appeals of kings to heaven in that age were of little value; but there is no direct evidence in history that Henry did either order or consent to the death of Richard. The accounts are conflicting. One chronicler says that Sir Pierce Exton, with a band of assassins, entered his prison at Pontefract, and that Richard, seizing a battle-axe, fell bravely fighting; another, that Richard died by voluntary starvation; while Froissart confesses that he could not state by what means he died, whether by a natural or by a violent death. One thing, however, is certain, that if Henry was innocent of this crime, which was laid to his charge, his memory must ever be held in abhorrence for a political crime of which no English monarch had up to this period been guilty.

Henry ascended the throne with the almost unanimous support of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The primate, Archbishop Arundel, was most zealous in his weak cause. The support of the clergy, however, was purchased by Henry at a fearful price. Before he ascended the throne, like his father, John of Gaunt, he had favoured the doctrines of the reformer, Wycliffe; but no sooner had he become king, than Arundel obtained the passing of a statute whereby all persons were required to renounce heresies, to deliver up heretical books, and submit themselves to the Church, on pain of being handed over to the secular arm, and be burned alive. Henry, therefore, was made the primate's instrument for the destruction of every one who dared to assail the corruptions of the Church. This subject, however, will be more fully considered in the succeeding article on religion.

Although by the issue of the battle at Shrewsbury the house of Lancaster was established on the throne, Henry had still to contend with numerous enemies, both native and foreign. War with Owen Glendower was still continued. In the year 1404, he had so successfully asserted his power, that the French government concluded a treaty with him as "Owen, prince of Wales." Henry of Monmouth again went into Wales to fight with Glendower; but, although he was

ful in some skirmishes, the campaign was s. Meanwhile, the French carried on a ry warfare with England. They attacked e, made frequent descents on the English and plundered every ship they could lay their on at sea. The isles of Jersey and Guernsey aptured, and Plymouth was plundered and by these French marauders. No war was d, and the French government disowned these tions, but it is clear they were connived at, if nctioned and supported, by that government. nglish, however, were not backward in making ls. Banding together, as in the reign of d I., the English sailors spread desolation on nch shores of the Channel, and made prizes of fleets of French merchantmen, loaded with le merchandize. More mischief in the end was y the English than by the French in this ry warfare, and neither government was in ion to protect their coasts from insults and s.

pular belief which existed in England caused considerable embarrassment for several years. elief was that Richard was still alive: that he caped from Pontefract, and was still living in d. It had been spread abroad when the Scots bout to make their foray into the north, under s, that Rutland was coming to assert his ; and associations were formed to welcome his and to co-operate with the Scots in an attempt re him to his throne. Richard came not; but ief in his existence had not yet faded away in ular mind. This year, indeed, it was revived reater force than ever. According to the old lers, a man named Serle, who had been a gen- of the bedchamber to Richard, having heard s old master was alive, came over from France w his services. Instead, however, of finding g, he only found one who bore some resemblance : Richard's court fool. Serle had been deceived, resolved to deceive others. He persuaded the to personate Richard, and having counter- Richard's privy seal, despatched letters to many late king's friends in England, assuring them would soon make his appearance among them. ffect was all that Serle could have desired. believed that Richard *would* soon appear, with of French and Scots, to fight for the reposses- his throne; and had he come he would have numbers ready to aid his cause. In Essex, the countess of Oxford, the mother of De Vere, fortunate duke of Ireland, had by her servants iously spread the news abroad, there were eady to take up arms in his favour. But the ce of Henry checked any outbreak that might risen from the rumour. Serle's secret mes- was arrested, and he having disclosed the of the parties with whom he had communi- among whom were many monks, they were nto custody and thrown into prison. The old ss of Oxford was imprisoned; and her secretary, d affirmed that he had seen and spoken with d, was drawn and hanged. Serle himself was ently captured, and perished as a traitor in . But the belief in Richard's existence still lingered in the popular mind. Proclamations were issued for several years against those who spread such a rumour, and some were punished with death for the offence; but still the belief was that the court fool in Stirling Castle was the veritable Richard himself. The belief has even been revived by some of our recent historians, who state that Richard's escape is proved by documents in the Record Office; that there are entries in the public accounts of Scotland, of expenses for his custody; and that he lived in a state of imbecility in Stirling Castle till the year 1419, when he died. There is every reason to believe, however, that this imbecile was the court fool, whom Serle had raised to the dignity of a monarch from his resemblance to King Richard. It is clear that the French believed in the death of the hapless monarch, for in the year 1406 his "child queen," now grown into womanhood, married the son of Henry's mortal enemy, the duke of Orleans.

During his reign Henry had been cautious in demanding aid and supplies from his parliament. But necessity knows no law. His wars, especially in Wales, had been very expensive; and at this time he was about to equip fleets to defend the coasts and the trade of the kingdom from the marauding Flemings and Easterlings, who, incited by the duke of Orleans, were cruising against the English in great ships, and committing the most atrocious cruelties. In the parliament of A.D. 1404, therefore, Henry demanded money for his necessities. The commons were not averse to granting him the aid he required, but they appear to have been very unwilling to vote it out of their own purses. Appearing in a body before the king, who was on his throne, they proposed that he should supply his wants chiefly by seizing on the revenues of the clergy, who at this period possessed a third part of the riches of the realm. The riches of the clergy it was asserted, made them negligent in their duty, and it would be an advantage both to church and state to lessen their incomes. It was a cool proposition, and one not likely to be acceded to without a stern opposition. Arundel took the lead. The stripping of the clergy of their estates would, he said, have the effect of stopping their prayers for the welfare of the state. Then falling upon his knees, the archbishop vehemently deprecated a sin so heinous as the invasion of the patrimony of the church. Henry appears to have instigated the commons to make the proposition, but when he found that the clergy had taken fire, knowing that they were the chief supporters of the throne, he declared that he would maintain them in their rights. It was his intention, he said, to leave the Church in a better condition than it was when he ascended the throne. Emboldened by this declaration, Arundel lectured the commons for making such a proposal; taxing them with irreligion, and with an impious desire of removing the burden from their own shoulders to those of their superiors. Notwithstanding, the commons retired and passed a bill for carrying the scheme into execution, which was rejected by the peers. Throughout the whole of his reign, Henry was obliged to court popularity; and the commons, sensible of their growing importance, under the rule of an usurper, acted

not only on this, but on other occasions, with an independence unknown to their predecessors. Thus, in the first year of his reign they procured a law that no judge, in concurring with any iniquitous measure, should be excused from punishment by pleading the orders of the king; in the second, they insisted on maintaining the practice of withholding supplies till their petitions were answered; and in this, the fifth year, they compelled him to dismiss several of his household, among whom was his confessor, because they had displeased them—the commons of England. Yet Henry appears to have been careful to have a packed house of commons, for on this occasion the sheriffs and mayors were directed not to return any man of learning, especially lawyers; whence it is known in history as "The lack-learning Parliament."

The attempt to seize the revenues of the clergy made a bad impression on the peers. Henry was evidently suspected of being the originator of the proposition, although he had so gracefully yielded the point. It certainly looked like double dealing, and it gave rise to much ill humour. Nay, it accelerated another insurrection. Early in the year 1405, the young earl of March and his brother, who were kept in close confinement in Windsor Castle, were surreptitiously liberated, but were retaken; and the false Rutland, now duke of York, was accused of being privy to the attempt, and was thrown into prison, where he lingered for several years. His fate excited no sympathy, for he was considered a traitor to all parties. It seems probable that York contemplated leading over the earl of March to old Percy, who was again in arms in the north, that he might be proclaimed king. With Percy there were associated the earl of Nottingham, Scroop, the archbishop of York, and Sir John Falconberg. The offence which Henry had given in the matter of the revenues of the Church, added to their numbers. Two great councils of the nobility and the clergy were called by Henry, the one at London, and the other at St. Albans; but at neither would they grant him any of his requests. On the contrary, some of the barons went straight from the council at St. Albans and joined the insurgents in the north. This insurrection assumed formidable proportions, but it was finally quelled. Sir John Falconberg, with a body of troops, was the first to take the field, but he was defeated by Prince John and the earl of Westmoreland. Subsequently Archbishop Scroop and the earl of Nottingham, at the head of eight thousand men, assembled in arms at Shipton-on-the-Moor. But the archbishop had no opportunity of fighting: by some means, unexplained in history, both he and the earl of Nottingham were entrapped and sent prisoners to Pontefract Castle. Hearing of their capture, old Percy fled into Scotland. Scroop and Nottingham were beheaded. The lay courts had no jurisdiction over a prelate, and Gascoigne, the upright chief justice of that period, refused to sit in judgment on the archbishop. But Henry resolved that he should die. It was his second offence, for he had been an instigator of the insurrection in which Hotspur had perished at Shrewsbury. When Gascoigne, therefore, refused the office of judge over him, Henry found one less scrupulous in the person of a knight, and probably a lawyer, named Fulthorp, who, without any form of trial, pronounced the sentence of condemnation. The execution of the archbishop was an offence against the Church, and the Pope issued a sentence of excommunication against all who were concerned in his death; but Henry justified his conduct, and as the Church was not in a condition to punish by force of arms, the sentence, now little dreaded, was revoked. After the death of these leaders, and the flight of the earl of Northumberland, Henry successfully besieged his castles of Prudhoe and Warkworth, and captured Berwick, which he had delivered to the Scots. Percy and Lord Bardolf had escaped to Edinburgh, where they were kindly received, and leaving them unmolested, Henry marched from the north into Wales, where his presence was much needed.

Early in this year, Henry of Monmouth had gained a great victory over Glendower at Grosmont; but his success was not attended with any decisive results. At this time, the Welsh hero had concluded a treaty with the French government as "Owen, prince of Wales;" and the duke of Orleans, who was now in reality the ruler of France—the French king being almost imbecile—resolved to aid him in his struggle It was not, however, till the year 1406 that the French came to his assistance: the first expedition prepared proving abortive. In that year a force of twelve thousand men-at-arms landed at Milford Haven, under the command of the marshal of Rieux and the Grand Master of the Arbalisters. Haverfordwest was destroyed by them and Caermarthen captured; and being here joined by Owen Glendower, they marched in triumph towards Worcester. Prince Henry retreated before them, but being joined at Worcester by his father with reinforcements, he again resumed the offensive. The French and Welsh now retired to a neighbouring hill, while the English advanced, and took up a position on an opposite height. A deep valley lay between the two armies, but neither would quit its position to risk a battle. During eight days there were constant skirmishes: but at the end of that time, the allies fell back into Wales for want of provisions. Ammunition and stores had been sent from France; but the fleet of the Cinque Ports had effectually prevented supplies from reaching the invaders. Henry and his son followed them in their retreat, but meeting with a severe repulse in a rash attack upon them—among defiles, woods, and marshes—and being himself also in want of provisions, he was in his turn compelled to retreat. The French, however, by this time were tired of the war. The entertainment they met with in Wales was not suited to their tastes, and they returned in all haste to France. Prince Henry still carried on the war against Owen Glendower; but although he subdued the whole of South Wales, and part of the north, the great chieftain was never subdued. The latter part of his career is involved in obscurity. It would appear, however, that he continued the war till A.D. 1409, when he was driven into exile; that though in the year 1411 he was exempted from a general pardon of the Welsh rebels, he still remained unconquered in his native mountains; and that several years after the accession of Henry V., he died among those mountains—free to the last day of his heroic

PRINCE HENRY AND CHIEF JUSTICE GASCOIGNE.

memory was fondly cherished in the legends
ntrymen, which "told of his wanderings in
tains, and his hidings in sea-girt caverns;"
yn's Cave" is still pointed out to travellers
st of Merioneth.

Henry of Monmouth was thus engaged in
e king crushed the last insurrection in
gainst his rule. In the year 1407 there
; discontent, arising from a demand for

The old earl of Northumberland took
of this circumstance to make another effort
e the king. From the time of his expulsion,
en unremittingly engaged in stirring up
his throne. He had been into Wales to
easures with Owen Glendower, and had
l from France and Flanders. His chief
obtaining support, however, was in Scot-
ined by several nobles on the Scottish
rly in the year 1408, the earl, and Lord
appeared in Northumberland, and captured
stles. Many of their old tenants flocked to
lard; and they marched in triumph as far
naresborough. But the people of the north
generally in favour of Henry's government,
heriff of Yorkshire, Sir Thomas Rokeby, at
of some troops hastily collected, marched
em, and a battle was fought at Bramham
Tadcaster, in which Northumberland closed
d career by falling in battle, and Bardolf
ounds of which he died after being taken

s probable that the Scottish nobles were
join Percy and Bardolf in this insurrection,
for an act of which Henry had recently
r—an act which well illustrates his unscru-
racter. A truce existed between the two
but, notwithstanding this, fortune had
his way the young heir of Scotland, and he
im as a prisoner in England. This prince,
James I. of Scotland, was proceeding to
be educated, and when sailing close to the
t Flamborough Head, the vessel was cap-
ome English cruisers. The young prince
the protection of the earl of Orkney, and it
in that, in an interview with Henry, the
of the existing peace, and urged that the
s, as the letters he had with him to the
urt proved, simply going abroad to be
French language. Henry is said to have
that was the case he could not have fallen
r hands, for he knew the French language
and would undertake his education. As
e education of the young prince, there can
tion but it received the strictest attention,
me one of the most accomplished scholars
but that does not render the transaction
nourable. His detention as a prisoner in
as as unjust as it was cruel. It is said
aptivity broke the heart of King Robert,
imself at the time a refugee in the isle of
her he had fled from the persecutions of
which was solely under the influence of the
duke of Albany. It is not improbable
egent was as guilty as King Henry in the
above recorded, that an agreement was
entered into between them that if Henry detained the duke's nephew, who was now heir to the Scottish crown, in England, he, on his part would detain the pretended Richard in Scotland. Be this as it may, the young prince was kept prisoner in England for eighteen years, being confined first in Pevensey Castle, and afterwards in the Tower, and in Nottingham and Windsor Castles.

The defeat and death of the old earl of Northumberland at Bramham Moor, and the exile of Owen Glendower, were succeeded by a period of great tranquillity. There were occasional troubles in the Welsh marches; the English possessions in France were continually attacked by the French; and there was a fierce desultory war carried on at sea between the English and French, but beyond this, Henry's latter years were marked by peace. As regards his French possessions, no effort was made to protect them, for he could never obtain sufficient money from his parliament for any great expedition for their defence. His parliament was his most successful opponent. It was, indeed, only by bowing to its will that he was enabled to retain possession of his throne. But, although he had surmounted every other obstacle, and was allowed to reign in peace by submission to the will of his parliament, his last years were spent in grief. They were clouded by disease, and by a difference with his son, the heir apparent. His numerous anxieties had rendered him prematurely old, and he was afflicted with a cutaneous disease and epileptic fits. Prince Henry's conduct added to the weight of his afflictions. Although his irregularities may have been exaggerated by the old chroniclers, and their exaggerations highly coloured by the great dramatist, Shakespeare, there is no reason to doubt his connection with wild associates and indulgence in excesses. A story is related that, on one occasion, when a companion was committed for a brawl, the prince drew his sword to intimidate the judge, and that Sir William Gascoigne, regardless of his rank, at once committed him to prison for the offence. But this story rests on doubtful authority. Nor does it appear that the estrangement between the king and the prince arose entirely, if at all, from the young prince's private character. It would rather appear to have originated in a seeming desire to conduct the government while yet his father lived, and in the actual performance of some regal acts without the king's consent. The whole history of King Henry shows that he was jealous of his kingly authority, and any interference with it, even on the part of the heir to the throne, would be likely to meet with his most lively resentment. And the young prince might have presumed too much on his popularity, and have been led to encroach upon his father's prerogatives; especially as soon after he came of age he had been made captain of Calais, and president of the council. He often acted in the latter capacity, as official records testify; and it is therefore more to his political than his moral conduct that the disunion between father and son must be attributed. That Henry was jealous of his son, is clear from the fact that during the latter years of his life he excluded him from all share in the public business, and was even displeased to see him at the head of his armies, because his mar-

tial talents had acquired for him a renown to which he himself had never attained. According to Stow, Henry was induced to believe, from his son's popularity, that he intended to usurp the crown, a belief which could only have arisen from his own jaundiced feelings; for, although Henry of Monmouth was ambitious, no act is recorded of him which would tend to show that he ever contemplated such a consummation. Henry had outlived his popularity, and the public homage was paid more to the rising than the setting sun; but the young prince never appears to have desired his father's dethronement. On the contrary, it is related that before Henry's death he embraced him with tears, and acknowledged that his suspicions of his fidelity and filial affection were unfounded, and that he would no longer listen to any reports that might be made to his prejudice. The breach was healed; and on the 20th of March, A.D. 1413, as Henry was praying before the shrine of St. Edward, in Westminster Abbey, he was seized with a fit, and, being carried into the abbot's apartments, he expired in the forty-seventh year of his age, and the thirteenth of his troubled reign. He had been twice married, first to Mary de Bohun, daughter and co-heir of the earl of Hereford, by whom he had four sons and two daughters; and next to Jane, daughter of the king of Navarre, and widow of the duke of Brittany, by whom there was no issue. He was buried by the side of Mary de Bohun, in Canterbury Cathedral.

SECTION II.

HENRY V. OF MONMOUTH.

HENRY, eldest son of the deceased monarch, surnamed of Monmouth, from the place where he was born, ascended the throne without opposition. His accession, indeed, was hailed with universal joy, and he was solemnly crowned on the 9th of April, A.D. 1413.

CRADLE OF HENRY V.

Edmund Mortimer, the rightful heir to the throne, was now grown to man's estate, but no mention is made of him as a competitor for the crown, and his claims appear to have been completely ignored by the nation. It is evident that Henry, unlike his father, did not look upon Mortimer as his rival, for one of his first acts was to release him from his captivity, and to restore him to his honours and estates. The magnanimity of Henry's character was further displayed by the restoration of the son of Henry Percy to his family inheritance; and the removal of the body of Richard II. from its obscure tomb in the friar's church of Langley to Westminster Abbey, where it was reinterred among the rightful kings of England. He also gave greater liberty to James of Scotland. And the commencement of Henry's reign was equally marked by wisdom as by a generous magnanimity. According to Holinshed and other chroniclers, he dismissed his former associates from his presence, having first acquainted them with his intended reformation, and exhorted them to follow his example. That which he has obtained the most credit for is, unfortunately, a poetical fiction; namely, the reappointment of Chief Justice Gascoigne, who, it was said, committed him to prison. Shakespeare thus records this more than doubtful story:—

> "What! rate, rebuke, and roughly send to prison
> The immediate heir of England. Was this easy?
> May this be washed in Lethe and forgotten."
> * * * * *
> "You are right Justice, and you weigh this well;
> Therefore still bear the balance and the sword."

At the same time, it is clear that Henry did retain all the wise ministers of his father in his service; and that the first acts of his government tended not only to increase his popularity among those who had steadily adhered to the cause of the House of Lancaster, but to convert many who had long been its bitter enemies, into warm and attached friends of that house.

But with all his wisdom and magnanimity, Henry allowed persecution to rage with great fury against the Lollards. It has been seen that on his father's accession to the throne, a cruel statute was enacted for the burning of heretics: a statute which the hierarchy was not slow in acting upon. Henry of Bolingbroke's severity grew with his years. In the tenth year of his reign, he pronounced severe sentences against the writings of Wycliffe, and in the following year he rejected a petition for the revocation of his statutes against the Lollards, and told the commons that the punishments should be made yet more rigorous. No doubt these harsh acts of his busy years added remorse to his latter days, a circumstance which should have acted as a warning to his successor. But Henry of Monmouth, like his father, was mainly supported on his throne by the hierarchy, and he, too, aided them in their persecution of the so-called heretic Lollards. Still Lollardism flourished. However severe the laws were against the preachers of the "new doctrines," they had not prevented their tenets from spreading not only through the nation, but far beyond the bounds of our island. In England the Lollards, though persecuted, retained considerable influence, and their tenets were more or less favoured by many of the nobles. As the Church was built upon a foundation of worldly riches and dominion, by the spread of Lollardism, popes and prelates became more and more alarmed; and in the first year of the reign of Henry V., they resolved to strike more effectual terror into the followers of Wycliffe, to prevent its further extension. Hitherto their victims had been of the meaner sort: now they resolved to take measures against one of their principal supporters—Sir John Oldcastle, who was commonly called Lord Cobham.

Oldcastle was a distinguished soldier of the day, and had been the private friend of the king before he came to the throne. He regarded the Lollards with so much favour that he was looked up to as their champion. His destruction, therefore, was plotted. One night during the first session of parliament placards were stuck up secretly on the church-doors, stating that there were one hundred thousand men ready to assert their rights. It was a mere fiction, or rather a wanton device, on which to found a charge of disloyalty as well as heresy against Oldcastle, thereby rendering his destruction doubly sure. The thought of such a host rising against his government alarmed Henry, in the midst of which Arundel appeared before him to lay an accusation against Oldcastle. The archbishop used all his eloquence to obtain his immediate arrest and execution; but Henry, remembering old friendship, undertook to reason with him, and if possible to bring the heretic back into the bosom of Holy Mother Church. But Oldcastle was proof against all the arguments of royalty: he had not so learned Christ as to deny him, even before his king. Henry lost his temper. He made some allusions to the statute against heretics, and to escape the storm, Oldcastle fled from Windsor to his manor of Cowling in Kent. Arundel now gained his point. Henry gave up his old friend to the archbishop's vengeance, and issued a severe proclamation against the Lollards. Oldcastle was cited to appear in the archbishop's court, but he failed to appear. But there was now no escape, for Henry was as incensed against him as Arundel. An armed force was sent to arrest him, and he was committed to the Tower. It was in vain that Oldcastle, unsupported and alone, pleaded for two whole days in the synod of prelates and abbots who assembled on his trial: he was sentenced to be burnt. Henry gave him fifty days' respite; but before that time had elapsed, he had escaped from the Tower and had fled into Wales, and although immense rewards were offered for his apprehension, it was three years before he again fell into the hands of his enemies.

Meanwhile the vengeance of Henry of Monmouth fell upon many of the Lollards. Immediately after Oldcastle's escape from the Tower, it was reported that the knights, and those who sympathized with him, contemplated treason; that they were plotting to seize the king and overthrow the throne. For that purpose, it was said twenty thousand men were about to assemble by night at an appointed time at St. Giles' Fields, above Holborn. Alarmed at this intelligence, at midnight, on the 7th of January, A.D. 1414, Henry issued forth from the city gates with a numerous army to encounter the rebels. It was the old comedy of "Much ado about Nothing." About eighty persons were assembled in "the pastoral meadows of St. Giles;" but the object of their meeting was very different from what had been reported; it was not to dethrone the king, but evidently for the double purpose of worship, and to concert measures for their personal security. There was no disturbance of the peace, and no resistance to the armed bands led against them, and yet some were killed on the spot, while others were seized, and either burned or hanged. Both Henry and his parliament seem really to have believed that the State was in danger. Harsh measures followed. Although within a few months a pardon was proclaimed to all the Lollards, for this so-called conspiracy, excepting Oldcastle—who certainly was not in London—and eleven others, prosecutions still continued. A new statute was passed, which not only gave magistrates and judges power to arrest all persons suspected of Lollardism, but even bound them by oath to do their utmost to extirpate the heresy. Hence the prisons of London were soon filled with captives, some of whom were executed, while the lands, goods, and chattels of all those convicted were, by this new statute, forfeited to the king as in cases of felony. Their oppressions became so grievous, that in the winter of A.D. 1417–18, the Lollards, driven to desperation by their persecutions, took up arms, hoping thereby to obtain, at least, a mitigation of the penal laws under which they suffered. At their entreaty, Sir John Oldcastle left his safe place of concealment in Wales to place himself at their head; and the Scots engaged to assist them. But it was in vain that they struggled for liberty of conscience. The Scots laid siege to the castles of Berwick and Roxburgh, but were obliged to retreat on the approach of the duke of Bedford, then regent of the kingdom; and Oldcastle was captured at St. Albans, and arraigned before the House of Lords, who condemned him to be burnt as a heretic. This sentence was executed with circumstances of great atrocity; but the aged warrior died with great courage, and he was regarded by the Lollards as a saint and martyr. And few have been thus honoured more justly. As he hung suspended by a chain over the fire which was to consume him, he was offered the assistance of a confessor. "No," said the heroic martyr; "God is here present, and to him alone will I acknowledge my sins—from him alone ask or expect pardon."

At this time the king was at war in France. Had he been in England, it may be doubted whether Oldcastle would have been executed, for it is remarkable that before he went to France, he had pardoned many prosecuted for heresy, even after they had been convicted. But the Church knew no pity. Arundel had been called to his account a few weeks after the commotions in London, and his successor, Chichely, was a still more bigoted and violent character. Zealous as Arundel had been for Mother Church, his zeal was far outstripped by that of Chichely. That prelate even stands charged with inciting the war with France, in order to save its moveables. And this seems likely; for on the accession of Henry, the measures which had been agitated in parliament, in the previous reign, against the luxury and possessions of the clergy, had been renewed with vigour. Hence the clergy trembled for their possessions, and it mattered but little to them what desolations and bloodshed were caused by war, so long as they could save that which was as dear to them as life itself—their wealth and grandeur.

The war which was commenced by Henry was one of the most unjust recorded in the pages of history. For a long period France had been in a most deplorable condition through faction. During the minority of Charles VI., the princes of the blood harassed the kingdom by factious proceedings; and after he assumed

the government, taking advantage of his imbecility, they still continued their rivalries. The nation was divided between the partisans of the duke of Orleans, the king's brother, and the duke of Burgundy, his uncle. Their rivalry led to murder. In the year 1407 there had been a seeming reconciliation between the rival princes, and they had slept in the same bed in token of perfect amity; but on the very evening that succeeded this close renewal of intimacy, Orleans was assassinated. A summons was sent to him to repair to the queen, who wished to consult him on affairs of state, and as he hastened to obey it, with but few attendants, a band of assassins, under the orders of Burgundy, slew him with their hatchets. But the death of Orleans brought no peace to the unhappy kingdom. For a time, the party of Orleans was intimidated; but when his son attained the age of manhood the strife was renewed with redoubled fury. The young duke had married the daughter of Count Armagnac, a Gascon nobleman of influence in his rude land, and of fierce and warlike habits. By his aid the party of Orleans was revived. Armagnac called towards Paris an army of Gascons, and a civil war commenced, which was marked at every step by inhuman ferocity. The Armagnacs and Burgundians alternately prevailed in the contest; and when Henry V. came to the throne, their struggle for power was at its height. His father, the late king, had endeavoured to avail himself of their distractions, by siding with one or the other party as best suited his policy. On one occasion, he sent a body of archers to aid the duke of Burgundy, and the Armagnacs were driven from the north of the capital, where they had been revelling in rapine and slaughter; and on another occasion he was in league with the Armagnacs, or Orleans party, who, in recompense for his assistance, were to restore to the English all their ancient possessions in France. No decisive blow, however, during his reign, was struck by either party. Success and reverse alternately ensued; and the conquerors and conquered pursued and fled, rolling like destructive waves over the necks of a ruined and prostrate people. Encouraged by this unhappy condition of the French nation, Henry V., who had been trained from his earliest years in war and policy, sent an embassy to Paris to negotiate for a prolongation of the truce between England and France; a truce which dated as far back as the reign of Edward III., and which had been several times renewed between the two kingdoms without any decided settlement of the great question then at issue—Edward's right and title to the throne of France. It was suggested when Henry's embassy was at Paris, that a pacification should be brought about by the marriage of the king of England with Catherine, the youngest daughter of the insane king of France; and it was also proposed to the duke of Burgundy that *his* daughter should be queen of England. As the Orleanists, however, were now supreme, no terms could be agreed upon. Henry now put in a claim to the crown of France in renewal of the old claim by Edward III.: the Archbishop Chichely being the instigator of this unjust and ambitious movement. He demanded the French crown as the representative of Isabella, the wife of Edward II., than which nothing could be more absurd; for even if Isabella's right were admitted, the earl of March, and not Henry of Bolingbroke, was the representative. It was unprincipled arrogance, and no wonder that his claim was rejected. The French government finally consented to give up all the ancient territories of the duchy of Aquitaine, and to give him the princess Catherine to wife, with a dowry of eight hundred thousand crowns; but on the 16th of April, A.D. 1415, he announced his determination at a great council to recover "his inheritance!"

Henry had previously obtained a liberal supply from parliament for "the defence of the kingdom of England and the safety of his seas;" but the supply was limited to that express purpose, although it was then known that he contemplated war with France. It may be presumed that the supply was diverted from that purpose, but it was not sufficient for the enterprise. No considerations, however, would turn him from his path to warlike fame. He pledged his jewels and his plate, and the clergy poured gold into his coffers to aid him in the unjust and unhallowed strife. That the clergy were his eager supporters is clear from a speech made by Chichely, and which was addressed to the king in full parliament. "Advance," said he, "your standard into France, and with assured hopes of victory, march to conquer those dominions which are your own by inheritance. There is no true Englishman but is ready to devote his life in so glorious a service; and in full possession of the justness of the war, *we*, the clergy, have given such a sum of money to maintain it, as was never granted to any of your predecessors, and will join all our prayers for the success of your arms." Nor were the nobles less eager for the war than the clergy. It became an essentially popular war, and a large army was quickly raised for its operations.

There are full particulars recorded of the measures which Henry took for this expedition. The great nobles and others contracted to furnish, at given rates, large bodies of troops, well mounted, armed, and arrayed. These rates were for a duke, 13*s.* 4*d.* per day; for an earl, 6*s.* 8*d.*; for a baron, 4*s.*; for a knight, 2*s.*; for every other man-at-arms, 1*s.*; and for an archer, 6*d.* The first quarter's wages were to be paid in advance, and pledges were given for the payment of the second quarter. The contracting parties agreed to attend the king for one year, and to be at Southampton on the 8th of July. Ships were hired in Holland, and the shipping of all the ports in England with the necessary seamen were impressed. As a precautionary measure, the exportation of gunpowder was prohibited. As before mentioned, the duke of Bedford was appointed regent for the security of the kingdom, and with him was associated a council of advice. The clergy, both regular and secular, were to be arrayed by the prelates in their respective dioceses for the defence of the realm; a nightly watch was to be kept in each town; no strangers were to remain in any tavern for more than a day and a night; and if they wished to do so, and refused to give their reasons for desiring a longer sojourn, they were to be arrested and sent to prison. Under an impression that the expedition might prove fatal, Henry and his followers made their wills: the king's concluding in these words in his own autograph:—"This is my last will, subscribed

ith my own hand.—R. H. Jesu mercy, and gremercy adie Marie help." This will was made at Win-ester, on the 24th of July, as he was on his route to uthampton. He was met at Winchester by the chbishop of Bourges, who had been sent on an abassy from France, in the vain hope of diverting e war. The chroniclers of the age accuse the arch-shop of having addressed the king with improper ldness; but there appears to be no ground for such accusation. Henry's conduct called for a spirited ply. The crown of France, he said, was his, and he ould win it by the sword. "My master, Charles," e archbishop replied, "has made the most liberal fers, not out of fear, but from compassion and a love peace, and if thou makest the attempt, he will call on the blessed Virgin and all the saints, and with eir aid, combined with the support of loyal subjects d faithful allies, thou wilt either be driven into e sea, or taken captive and slain." Neither con-ssion nor plain speaking availed: Henry went to set his forces at Southampton. Before he embarked, conspiracy against him was discovered. Some counts say that it was instigated by the French urt; but there can be but little doubt that it was r the purpose of placing the earl of March, the gitimate heir of the crown, upon the throne. The ief conspirators were Richard, earl of Cambridge, other to the duke of York; Lord Scrope; and Sir omas Grey, all of whom were executed; but erciless as Henry was to these prime movers of the ot, the earl of March was pardoned, and was even noured by having the post assigned to him of hting by his side in the coming struggle.

The truce between England and France expired on e 2nd of August, and nine days after, fifteen hun-ed vessels, on board of which were men-at-arms, chers, miners, gunners, armourers, and all the rious attendants of a feudal army, amounting to out thirty thousand men, set sail from Southampton. he armament made the mouth of the Seine on uesday the 13th, and the next day the army landed Clef de Caux, about three miles from Harfleur, ithout opposition. The landing of the troops and ores occupied three whole days; and it is remark-le that it was never resisted, as the place of disem-rkation presented many natural and artificial ob-acles, and the resistance of a few hundred brave en would have been sufficient to have driven back many thousands. The constable of France, d'Albret, as at Rouen, with numerous troops, but he made no fort to drive back the invaders; and the hardy ople of the coast suffered them to land as though ey were friends. The army took up a position on e hill nearest Harfleur, and on the 17th it moved the siege of that town in three battalions. After a onth's siege, Harfleur was captured, but during its erations thousands of the besiegers had fallen vic-ms to a fearful dysentery. Many of the most minent captains thus perished, while others, among hom was Mortimer, earl of March, were sent home invalids. While at Harfleur, Henry sent a chal-nge to the dauphin of France, to meet him in single mbat; but no reply was given. The challenge as given in a spirit of chivalry, and, perhaps, was an meaning defiance, but Henry had reasons for wish-ing to end the dispute in a summary manner. Be-sides those of his troops who had perished and were disabled by disease, many deserted, and he had to leave a garrison at Harfleur, so that if he advanced, the remnant of his forces was utterly inadequate to the task of conquest. Not more than about nine thousand men in a condition for fighting remained under his banner. At a council held on the 5th of October, he was strongly urged to return to England by sea. But his pride revolted from such a course. It was in vain that it was represented that the French armies were being continually reinforced, and would very likely hem them in on all sides: he de-termined to march to Calais. In the presence of a foreign army, the French had at this time suspended their quarrels, and were preparing to drive the English from their country. But Henry was un-daunted. To advance seemed the height of rashness, but had he returned to England with the loss of two-thirds of his army, and without accomplishing any-thing beyond the capture of a small town, he would have risked the loss of his popularity, and perhaps his throne. It was on the 8th day of October that he commenced his march, one of the most extraordinary in the English annals. His little army had only eight days' provisions when it left Harfleur for Calais, and before he set out, Henry issued a proclamation that no one, under pain of death, should commit any excesses against the peaceful inhabitants, or take any-thing except victuals and necessaries. His army marched in three battalions along the coast to the Somme, and he was obliged to ascend that river nearly to St. Quentin, before he was able to cross it, every ford and passage up to that point being guarded. The French had challenged him to fix a day and a field of action; and he had sarcastically replied that he did not skulk within walls or towns, but held his way, and pitched his camp in the open field; adding that they might choose any post between him and Calais, and that if he was impeded he would cut his way through their forces. The delay caused by his march along the Somme gave them ample time to act upon this suggestion, and accordingly they posted themselves on a road which the English must pursue, between the villages of Agincourt and Framecourt.

The French, fifty thousand strong, were under the command of the constable d'Albret, and, except the king, the dukes of Berri and Burgundy, and all the princes of the blood were present. Paris offered to send six thousand burgesses, but the offer was rejected with contempt. They had, replied the chivalrous leaders of the French, already three times the number of the English, and they did not require the aid of shopkeepers. The princes and nobles believed they had nothing to dread from the presumption of King Henry, and they looked upon his followers as their certain prey. On the night before the battle, indeed, the French knights spent its silent hours playing at dice, the stakes being the ransom of their expected prisoners. In the English camp there was little sleep, but its hours were spent in a different manner. There was bloody work for them to do on the morrow, and while the armourers were at work, the priests were confessing their penitents, for well they know that

with so many thousand enemies before them, they had cause to fear that before the close of that morrow, many of them might sleep the sleep of death. But all were resolved, with the king, to conquer or die. England, said Henry, should never have to pay a ransom for him; and not one of his followers spoke of surrender. As for retreat or flight, that was impossible, for the English were in want of provisions, and the French were well provided with a numerous and well-equipped troop of cavalry.

The night of the 24th of October was cold and stormy. Henry passed that night at Maisioncelles, a large, straggling village within a few bowshots from the enemy's outposts. As the day dawned—the feast of St. Crispin—he heard three masses, and then armed himself for battle. Then mounting a grey pony, he led his troops to their positions. His little band of knights were posted in the centre, so that their banners were thick together, and the archers were placed on the sides, and strewn along the front. Two bodies of archers were concealed in ambush in the villages of Agincourt and Framecourt, which the French had left unprotected. A novel mode of defence was devised by Henry to protect the archers from the attacks of cavalry. Every one was provided with a stake sharpened at each end, to plant in the ground before him, the upper end, which projected towards the foe, being tipped with iron. Having made his dispositions, Henry rode on his grey pony along the lines of each division, and as he rode from rank to rank, exhorted them to do their duty. As he passed along, Sir Walter Hungerford was overheard to say that he wished some of the gallant knights who were living in idleness and luxury in England could be present. "No!" exclaimed Henry, "I would not have a single man more. If God gives us the victory, the more will be our honour; and if we perish, the loss will be less to our country." Meanwhile, the French had marshalled their forces for the conflict. They were formed in three lines, completely covering the road to Calais. Their advanced guard consisted of about eight thousand knights and esquires, and about five thousand five hundred archers and crossbowmen. The greater part of these were composed of the French nobility. The main body was far more numerous. According to the lowest estimate, their lines consisted of full twenty men in depth. They were flanked by two woods, and were so crowded together that they had not room to fight as they stood, or to extend their line. The exact number of their forces cannot be stated, some contemporary chroniclers estimating them at fifty thousand, and others at three times that number. It seems probable, however, that they were ten times as many as the English. But the issue of the contest proves that numbers, when not scientifically arranged, and led by able generals, cease to be an advantage. But there they stood in dense array, and seemed to be impregnable. We say *stood*, for their tactics were the reverse of those upon which they acted in the battles of Poictiers and Cressy. In those battles they had assumed the offensive, and commenced the attack, now they awaited it. Perhaps the old duke of Berri, who had fought in the battle of Poictiers, sixty years before, had reminded them of the disastrous consequences of such a mode of fighting, or the French had, in sight of the English, lost somewhat of their overweening confidence. Moreover, not a horse in their quarters had neighed during the night, which they considered a bad omen, and this may have damped their ardour. The two armies passed several hours inactive and silent, the English sitting down quietly to breakfast, as their forefathers had done at Cressy, awaiting the shock of battle. Still the French stirred not, they were determined to remain on the defensive. It would appear, indeed, that numerous as they were, the constable desired to await the arrival of reinforcements, which were on their march, under the marshal de Loigny and the duke of Brittany; and that in order to gain time for their arrival, he sought to amuse Henry by negotiation. In the course of the morning he sent messengers to him, offering a free passage to Calais if he would restore Harfleur and the prisoners he had taken, and resign his pretensions to the French crown; but Henry was not to be thus deceived. Time was precious to him: in another day or two his troops would have been on the point of starvation, and as his enemies would have been increased, his only chance of safety was to move onward. As, therefore, the French would not come to him, he prepared to go to them. It was towards noon when he gave the order for his banners to advance; and, in a moment, Sir Thomas Erpingham, a knight grown grey with honour, threw his truncheon in the air, and exclaimed, "Now strike!" Monstrelet says that Henry and all his knights dismounted, and that the English knelt for a brief moment to invoke the protection of God, and to place a small piece of earth in their mouths, in remembrance that they were formed of dust, and to dust should return. It was a solemn moment; but as they rose from their knees, they shouted the national "hurrah!" and boldly advanced. On the archers went, with bowstrings drawn, to meet the mailed chivalry of France. They had no armour of defence, but they shrank not from the charge. Thick flew their deadly shafts, and it was in vain that the French stooped to avoid them, many fell at the first flight of their well-aimed arrows. Cliquet de Brabant and the count de Vendome were ordered to advance with a body of knights to clear away the archers; but the field, which had been lately sown, was soaked with rain, and the trampling had converted it into deep mud, so that the horses, encumbered with men in heavy armour, could not extricate themselves to charge with effect. Planting their sharpened stakes into the earth for a defence, again the archers sent from their well-strung bows a flight of arrows, and this time their execution was still more fearful. Galled and maddened by them, the horses rushed back on the main body of the French, and threw it into confusion. The decisive moment was come. Removing their stakes, and slinging their bows behind them, the English archers rushed with their bill-hooks and hatchets into the midst of the steel-clad knights, and the constable of France, and many of the most illustrious French knights, fell before them. The chivalry of France were slaughtered in heaps by these despised plebeians, and their whole body was dispersed. Those who escaped fled through an opening made for them in

the second division, a movement which was attended with increased disorder. A fresh charge of horse was made, led by Anthony, duke of Brabant, but he was instantly slain, and the archers still advancing, destroyed all that opposed them. The second line, however, closed up, and, for a while, stood their ground manfully. It was now, indeed, that the real battle took place. In the conflict Henry's life was repeatedly in danger. Eighteen French knights had bound themselves by oath either to take or kill him, and one of them felled him to the ground with a blow of his battle-axe, but his soldiers closed round him, and killed every one of them. The duke of Alençon then cut his way to the royal standard of England, and, after striking the duke of York to the ground, cleft the crown in twain which Henry wore over his helmet; but the English closed upon him, and he too was slain. The battle was now over. The second division, on the fall of Alençon, fled in dismay; and the third, which had never drawn sword, and which still far outnumbered the English, galloped in hot haste from the bloody field. Hitherto no prisoners had been taken, but they now surrendered in heaps. The number captured exceeded that of the victors, and as a body of them presented a show of resistance, Henry gave orders that each man should kill his prisoners; and as this was refused, a body of two hundred archers were directed to execute this odious task. Many of the French were thus massacred in cold blood. But Henry's nature was not cruel. The day before the battle he had discharged all the prisoners brought with him from Harfleur upon their parole, and as soon as he found that his danger was imaginary, he stopped the carnage. The instinct of self-preservation dictated the order; and even the French chroniclers of the age record the horrible circumstance in terms of sorrow rather than of condemnation. The circumstance appears to have arisen from a body of French peasants, who had collected in the rear of the English to plunder their baggage, and not from any renewed resistance of the French army, for those who had escaped were still fleeing for their lives. It was a mistake; but a great number of French knights perished in consequence of that mistake, and none more regretted it than Henry himself.

The loss in this famous battle of Agincourt, on the side of the French, was appalling. Monstrelet, the French chronicler, says that never had so many and such noble men fallen in one battle. Among the slain were seven princes of the blood; and, in all, there perished in the short space of less than half a day, eight thousand gentlemen, knights, or esquires, of whom one hundred and twenty were nobles bearing banners. Among the most distinguished prisoners were the dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, the counts of Richemont, Eu, and Vendome, the Marshal Boucicault, and the lords of Harcourt and Craon. Mountjoye, the herald of the king of France, was captured; and when Henry, after the battle, asked him to whom the honour of the victory was due, to himself or the king of France? he replied, "To you, the king of England." That victory was not obtained without some loss on the part of the English; but the estimates of that loss are very conflicting. The French chroniclers of the period assert that it was sixteen hundred, and there is no reason to believe that it fell far short of that number. As the battle was chiefly fought by men of inferior degree, it was among them that the loss was heaviest; but the duke of York—the false Rutland—and the earl of Suffolk were among the slain, the former meeting with a more honourable fate than he deserved. Learning the name of an adjoining castle, Henry ordered the battle to be named after it—"the battle of Agincourt"—a name by which it will be known as long as the history of England endures.

Turner remarks upon this battle justly: "The laurel of Agincourt was the prize of temerity without necessity; of a chivalrous defiance of danger, too much like ostentatious confidence to be safely commended; and was won, not only against all calculation, but against all hope. But what reasoning can justify wars and enterprises that produce such a quantity of human slaughter and suffering, which even the soldiers who inflicted it could not look at without lamenting? Such sympathy, and yet such actions, display the anomalous medley which so often deforms human nature. Compassionate yet cruel; tender-hearted yet pitiless; benevolent at one moment, unfeeling at another; kind even to animals, and yet ruthless against his fellow-creatures." Well might the poet Cowper, in his righteous indignation of the curse of the human race—war—exclaim—

> "War is a game, which, were their subjects wise
> Kings would not play at. Nations would do well
> To extort their truncheons from the puny hands
> Of heroes; whose infirm and baby minds
> Are gratified with mischief, and who spoil,
> Because men suffer it, their toy, the world."

Henry slept on the night after the battle at Maisoncelles, and on the following morning set out for Calais, the duke of Orleans, his prisoner, riding by his side as though they had been old friends. The duke had been for some hours inconsolable, and had refused to eat and drink; but Henry had cheered him with fair words, and he became reconciled to his fate. The English had already stripped the wounded and the dead of their armour and their best clothes, and as they crossed the field of blood, they put an end to the sufferings of many who were unable to move. The booty they had obtained was so great that they almost sank under its weight, but after a slow and tedious march, they reached Calais. The same day they arrived there—the 29th of October—the news of the victory reached London, and all the bells of the city churches sent forth their merry peals. What mattered it that in twenty-five roods of ground pits had been dug, and thousands of the aristocracy of France had been buried therein, as in one vast sepulchre? And what mattered it that thousands more had been buried in the woods whither they had crawled, or had been left a prey to the wolves and ravens? And what mattered it that the English army itself had been, from disease and the sword, reduced to a mere skeleton? It was a victory—men called it a glorious one—and the nation to whom the victors belonged must have their fill of rejoicing. That rejoicing lasted many days; and to this hour England points to the field of Agincourt with a glow of pride, as though victorious ambition is true and lasting

glory. As for the victor, Henry, he became the nation's idol. On arriving at Calais he called a council, and as he wanted men and money before he could take any further steps to secure the phantom of which he had been in search, the council determined that it was his wisdom to return to England. He remained at Calais till the 17th of November, by which time not only London, but all England, had heard of his victory. Joy beamed in every countenance: the people were literally mad with joy and triumph. When their hero appeared at Dover with his royal and noble captives, they rushed into the sea to meet him, and carried him to shore on their shoulders. England had produced many valiant kings, but Henry of Monmouth was the most valiant of them all. At Canterbury, Rochester, and every town through which he passed, thousands met him to do him honour; but it was when he reached Blackheath that the greatest honour was paid him. There he was met by the lords, commons, and clergy, and by the mayor, aldermen, and citizens of London, who conducted him in triumph into the capital. Rome itself never showed more honour to her conquerors than was shown to the hero of Agincourt. Wine flowed like water in the streets, every house was decorated, and every one greeted him with loud huzzas. There never was such a hero as Henry of Monmouth, the victors of Poictiers and Cressy, men of immortal memory, paled before him. As for parliament, its generosity for his deeds of arms was unbounded: all the supplies he asked for were readily granted; nay more, for its members, in the fulness of their joy, granted him that which they had regretted in the days of Richard II., inasmuch as it had made him a tyrant—the subsidy on wool and leather for life. But it must be recorded to Henry's honour, that with all his mad thirst for foreign conquest, he was submissive to constitutional restrictions in his government, and never showed any inclination to play the tyrant at home. On the contrary, he lived in harmony and friendship with his parliament, and the chief regret of his faithful people was, that so much of his time was spent in the field of his ambition—France.

Henry remained in England during the following year. He still, however, continued to cherish his ambitious projects, and prepared for their accomplishment. The French, themselves, favoured those projects. In the spring of the year 1416, Sigismund, king of the Romans and emperor elect, came to England in the vain hope of reconciling the kings of England and France, and he was followed to the English court by French ambassadors, and by William of Bavaria, count of Holland and of Hainault, who seconded his mediation. But it was all to no purpose: Henry was still resolved to win the crown of France. While they were in England, the French besieged Harfleur by land and water, and the earl of Dorset, its governor, was quickly compelled to send to England for succour. Harfleur, however, was relieved from the blockade by the duke of Bedford, the king's brother, who, with some ships hastily collected, sailed to the mouth of the Seine, and captured the large carracks and other vessels that kept it; on which the land troops raised the siege, and fled. In the meantime, the rival parties in France were more intent upon destroying each other than maintaining the independence of the kingdom. In the fullest sense of the word, it was a kingdom divided against itself. The duke of Brabant and the count of Nevers had both been slain in the field of Agincourt, but, notwithstanding this, their brother, the duke of Burgundy, steeped in animosity against the Armagnacs, had, at this early period after the battle, laid aside his resentment to King Henry, and had even formed an alliance with him. The feuds of the Burgundians and Armagnacs, so far from being allayed by the common danger by which France was beset by Henry's pretensions to its crown, had become more violent than ever. Each faction laid upon the other the blame of the disaster, but neither party learned wisdom by the catastrophe. Shame and grief had for a moment overwhelmed them, but it passed away as a shadow, and their bitter enmities returned with redoubled violence. By the captivity of the duke of Orleans, and the death of the constable, and other leaders, the Armagnac party was greatly shattered; but, by the activity of the count, he still held possession of Paris, and kept the Burgundians at bay. Such was the state of affairs when, in the year 1417, the king of England again embarked with a mighty army at Southampton, to renew his contest for the throne of France. At this time his ambition had led him to believe that he was an instrument in the hands of God, in punishing the crimes of the French nation. It was not him, he said, that had made the slaughter at Agincourt, but the Almighty, and, as he believed, for the sins of the people. He resumed operations, therefore, in the twofold capacity of an avenger of God's wrath, and an ambitious conqueror.

The army which Henry led into Normandy was far more numerous and powerful than that with which he had besieged Harfleur. It consisted of about sixteen thousand men-at-arms, and about an equal number of archers, besides a body of artificers of all kinds, with numerous sappers and miners. He landed at Tonque, near Harfleur, and there were none to oppose him. As if acting in concert with him, the duke of Burgundy was, at this crisis, marching upon Paris, breathing vengeance upon the "treacherous and poisoning Armagnacs." He would exterminate them, he said, by fire and sword! The work Henry had to do in Normandy was therefore easy. Its towns successively fell before him, and as fortress after fortress was secured, the estates of the Norman lords were confiscated, and bestowed upon his English followers: just as at the time of the Norman Conquest, William the Conqueror had bestowed the estates of the English barons upon the Normans. Distracted with the movements of the duke of Burgundy, the French government made no effectual resistance. Henry was everywhere victorious; but winter set in before the whole of Normandy was reduced, and he established his court at Caen. During his operations, the French court had sued for a peace or truce, but he would grant neither, except on the conditions that the Princess Catherine should become his wife, and that he should be declared regent and successor to the throne upon the death of Charles, conditions which were haughtily rejected.

The year 1418 was an eventful year for France. The duke of Burgundy had reached Paris, and had laid siege to it, but he had been compelled to raise the siege and retreat. His partisans had been expelled, and the count of Armagnac had the young dauphin Charles, as well as the imbecile monarch, in his hands. But though foiled, Burgundy was not conquered. Armagnac had deprived the queen of her power as regent, and had sent her as a prisoner to Tours. Ever since the death of her lover, the duke of Orleans, the queen had been implacable in her enmity to the duke of Burgundy; but the count of Armagnac had not only deprived her of the regency, and kept her as a prisoner, but had been the means of the destruction of Bois-Bourdon, who had the place of Orleans in her affections. At the order of the king, he had been sewn up in a bag and thrown into the Seine! Her resentment was now turned against Armagnac. A messenger was sent to the duke of Burgundy to hasten to her relief at Tours, and leaving Corbeille on the Seine, which he was besieging, he suddenly appeared before that town, and delivered the queen from her captivity. Isabella bestowed upon her deliverer, whom she called her "very dear cousin," the appointment of governor-general of the kingdom: that appointment being made in her capacity of regent, which she asserted had been irrevocably conferred on her by her husband, the king, and his council of state. There was now a reaction in Paris. Hitherto its citizens had warmly espoused the cause of the count of Armagnac, but his rule had been one of severity and terror, and they now desired his overthrow. Aware of this change in their sentiments, the count redoubled his cruelties, and resolved to repress treason by the sword. Nor was it in Paris alone that a reaction took place. Most of the towns, except those that were captured or besieged by King Henry, declared for the queen and the duke, and her court, which was held at Chartres, became thronged with princes and the great lords of the country. Enraged at this turn of affairs, the count sent his captains from Paris, who took several towns and castles from the Burgundians, and slew their garrisons. But his rule was drawing to a close. The young dauphin was tired of his servitude to the Armagnacs, and a secret negotiation was entered into to place the whole power of the government of the kingdom in the hands of the duke of Burgundy and the queen. A treaty to that effect, subject to ratification, was signed at the village of La Tombe, and the effect of it when made known in Paris was magical. Relying on the strong garrison he had in the city, the count of Armagnac resolved to oppose this family compact. He denounced those who had proposed this treaty as traitors; but notwithstanding his proscriptions, opposition to his authority became more and more stern. A blow given to the son of a rich iron merchant by one of the Armagnac men-at-arms, was as a match to the mine. The citizens rose in arms, threw open the Porte St. Germain des Pres to the Burgundian garrison of Pontoise, and for several days there was a fearful massacre of the Armagnacs. This occurred at the end of May. Then there was a pause; but on the 12th of June there was a cry that the duke of Burgundy was at the gates of the city, and the massacre was renewed. Many of the Armagnacs had been held as prisoners, and the people, breaking open the prisons and private houses where they were confined, massacred hundreds of them among whom was the count himself. The cruelties committed during this reign of terror are too horrible to relate; nor were they stopped, when, on the 14th of July, the queen and the duke of Burgundy entered Paris. All suspected of being opposed to the new government were put to death.

Meanwhile, Henry had been pursuing his victorious career. In the spring of this year he had received powerful reinforcements, and he began the campaign by laying siege to several places at once. By the beginning of July, all Lower Normandy was subdued, though not without a stern resistance. Having organized a government in Lower Normandy, he carried his main force over the Seine, and laid siege to Rouen, the capital of Upper Normandy. That city was strongly fortified. On two sides it was washed by the Seine, and on all sides it was walled and defended by towers and batteries. Its siege is one of the most memorable in the pages of history. For six months it withstood all the attempts of the English to take it. The people of Rouen, headed by chiefs who had retired before Henry, resolved to resist to the last extremity. It was on the 30th of July, that he invested the city, and finding that the garrison was numerous, and ever ready to make sorties upon his troops, and that he could not hope to take it by assault, he determined to reduce it by a more efficacious system—by famine. Deep ditches were dug on the land-side, and his lines were fortified with towers and artillery. During the progress of these works, which exceeded two miles in length, the garrison often sallied out and fought bravely, but ineffectually, with his troops. At length, however, they were finished, and then the garrison could neither attack nor receive either succour or provisions on the land-side. The river was still open to them; but to cut off all supplies from the upper part, troops were stationed along the banks and the islands of the Seine, while the stream itself was barricaded with iron chains. A bridge of boats, also, well manned with archers, was thrown over it above the town; while the lower part of the river was defended by two hundred small vessels, which were constantly sailing to and fro, and its mouth was guarded by a strong fleet and the garrison of Harfleur. The population of Rouen was great; some chroniclers stating the number as high as three hundred thousand; at the lowest computation, it was a hundred and fifty thousand. Whatever the numbers may have been, the inhabitants of that ancient city of narrow streets were shut up to starve. Their miseries were fearful. Many thousands died for want. Holinshed, describing their sufferings, says: "If I should rehearse, according to the reports of divers writers, how dearly dogs, rats, mice, and cats were sold within the town, and how greatly they were, by the poor people, eaten and devoured, and how the people daily died for fault of food; and young infants in the streets on their mother's breasts, lying dead, starved for hunger—the reader might lament their extreme miseries. A great number of poor simple creatures were put out of the gates, who were, by the Englishmen that kept the trenches, driven back again

to the lower gates, which they found closed and shut against them. And so they lay between the walls of the city and the trenches of the enemy, still crying for help and relief, for lack of which great numbers of them daily died." Edward III., when besieging Calais, had permitted the inhabitants thrust out of its gates by the garrison to pass through his lines, and find a home wherever they could, but Henry showed no such compassion. It is said that on Christmas-day, that great day of Christian rejoicings, he allowed some food to be distributed among the poor outcasts then outside the gates of Rouen; but beyond this, his mercy was not extended. At length famine did its work. On the 19th of January, A.D. 1419, its brave garrison capitulated. They were allowed to march out without arms, on condition that they would not serve against Henry for one year; but it must be recorded, to his disgrace, that after the city surrendered, its mayor or commandant was beheaded. Thus one of the noblest cities of France fell under the English rule, and Henry built a palace there, and held his court as duke of Normandy.

The young dauphin had entered into a treaty with the queen and the duke of Burgundy to be reconciled, but no such reconciliation had been effected. Their mutual animosities were still as rife as ever. Charles was a mere stripling; but he surrounded himself by the old captains of the Armagnacs, and held a court and parliament at Poictiers, while the duke of Burgundy ruled at Paris. Both the dauphin and the duke had promised to relieve the citizens of Rouen; but they were more intent upon circumventing each other than of organising any effectual resistance to the common enemy. The fall of Rouen carried dismay into every quarter of France. After its capture Henry prepared to march upon Paris. It was a critical moment for France. Paris was undefended. The king, the queen, and the duke of Burgundy were there, but on hearing of the advance of Henry, the court removed to Lagny. It was hoped that the two factions would, in this hour of danger, cease their strifes, and unite their forces to stem his progress. That hope was vain. On the contrary, both parties sought to form a separate alliance with Henry; each desiring by his aid to crush his rival. As Henry advanced towards Paris, the duke of Burgundy sent ambassadors, offering conditions of peace. Henry was then at Vernon, and the king, the queen, and the duke had removed to Provins. As these conditions appeared to be advantageous, the earl of Warwick was despatched to Provins, and it was arranged between him and the French court that King Charles and the king of England should have a meeting. The place of rendezvous fixed upon was on the right bank of the Seine, near the town of Melun, and the time of meeting the 30th of May. Rich tents were pitched for the two kings; but although Henry made his appearance, Charles came not. The queen, however, and her fair daughter Catherine, with the duke of Burgundy met the English monarch, and graceful courtesies passed between them, but nothing more. Henry was smitten by the charms of the French princess, and expressed himself anxious to form a matrimonial alliance with her; but with her hand he demanded concessions which were incompatible with the dignity of the French crown. These concessions were the full and complete execution of the treaty of Bretigny; the cession of Normandy; and the absolute sovereignty of all his other conquests. On these conditions—and these alone—he said he would resign his claims to the French crown. A whole month was spent in conferences and deliberations on these demands; but on the part of the French court, it was only to gain time. While thus negotiating with Henry other negotiations were pending. During the deliberations Henry resided at Mantes, on the left bank of the Seine, and the duke and the queen at Pontoise, on the right bank of the river, twenty-five miles nearer to Paris. In the interval, however, the duke of Burgundy had secretly concluded a treaty with the dauphin; each agreeing to share the royal authority during the lifetime of King Charles, and to unite their armies in order to resist "the ancient enemies of the kingdom." This alliance seemed to cut off from Henry all hopes of farther success; but its issue proved favourable to his pretensions. It was the dauphin who sought this alliance, feeling assured that if the queen, and his rival, the duke of Burgundy, came to terms with Henry, his party would inevitably be crushed. But he meditated treachery, or, if he did not, the old captains of the Armagnacs did. Under cover of a reconciliation, in order to repel the English, *they* contemplated revenge upon the duke of Burgundy. When the duke and the dauphin met to complete their treaty of alliance, they had kissed each other, and had sworn eternal friendship with an oblivion of all past quarrels; but all "was false and hollow." On finding that he had been deceived, undismayed by the promulgated treaty between the rival factions, Henry marched rapidly towards Paris. Crossing the Seine, he captured Pontoise, and his victorious troops were quickly at the very gates of Paris. The city was still undefended, for, notwithstanding their oaths and promises, the rival factions had not been reconciled. Each accused the other of treachery; but, at length, a conference was agreed upon between the duke and the dauphin. It was proposed by the latter for the good of France. The courtiers of the duke counselled him not to meet the dauphin, reminding him that he was surrounded by the servants of the duke of Orleans, whom he had assassinated, and by men whose friends and relations had been recently massacred in Paris. Hume remarks "how both or either of them could with safety venture upon this conference, it seemed somewhat difficult to conceive. The assassination perpetrated by the duke of Burgundy, and still more his open avowal of the deed, and defence of the doctrine, tended to dissolve all the bands of society; and even men of honour, who detested the example, might deem it just, on a favourable opportunity, to retaliate upon the author. The duke, therefore, neither dared to give, nor could pretend to expect, any trust, agreed to all the contrivances for mutual security which were proposed by the ministers of the dauphin." Although warned, the duke resolved to meet his cousin: it was his duty, he said, to adventure his person for the blessing of peace, and if he was killed, he should die a martyr! The place appointed for the meeting was on the bridge of Montereau. Both pledged their solemn oaths for each other's

safety. Each were to meet on the bridge with only ten knights. At each end of the bridge were two barriers, but there was no barrier in the centre for mutual protection. Into this open space the dauphin and the duke entered, each having with him the stipulated number of attendants. When the duke advanced, the dauphin was in a sort of gallery in the centre of the bridge, and as he approached the heir to the throne, he took off his velvet cap, which he wore instead of his helmet, and bent his knee before him. That was the moment of vengeance. The duke had left his attendants a little behind him, and as he thus saluted the dauphin, Tanneguy du Chatel pushed him down and struck him with his axe, and this blow was quickly followed by another, which laid him prostrate at the feet of the dauphin. As he still breathed, two other of the dauphin's attendants despatched him with their swords: the death of the duke of Orleans and the massacre of the Armagnacs was avenged.

But this foul murder was fatal to the interests of the dauphin. He gave out that he had been insulted and threatened by the duke at the interview; but this shallow defence was of no avail: he was universally deemed to be a murderer. The blame of the action entirely fell upon him, and the whole state of affairs became changed by the incident. The city of Paris, which was devoted to the family of the duke of Burgundy, broke out into the highest fury against him; while the court of King Charles entered into the same views from personal interests. All the ministers of that monarch owed their preferment to the late duke, and fearing their downfall, if the dauphin should succeed in his enterprise, which was to get the person of the king into his possession, made every effort to increase the number of his enemies. Never was a more impolitic crime committed. Throughout France, which was accustomed to scenes of bloodshed, it excited universal horror. As for Philip, the young duke of Burgundy, he resolved to avenge the death of his father. He was married to a daughter of the king of France; and when he received the news of the tragedy, he resolved to prosecute the assassin to the utmost extremity. Hastening to Henry V., he tendered him the crown of France, with the promise of his utmost aid to support his claim. His views were even seconded by Queen Isabella and the council of Government. As Hume rightly observes, "in the general transport of rage, every consideration of national and family interest was buried in oblivion by all parties; the subjection to a foreign enemy, the expulsion of the lawful heir, and the slavery of the kingdom appeared but small evils if they led to the gratification of the present passion." As to the people of Paris, adverse as they were to the rule of the English, they were still more hostile to the Armagnacs, who, with the dauphin at their head, were desolating the country. Henry, indeed, was now universally regarded as an ally to be courted, rather than as an enemy to be opposed.

Henry received ambassadors from Philip and Queen Isabella at Pontoise. The dauphin had previously sought an alliance with him, but he wisely declined to espouse his cause. His interests lay with the young duke of Burgundy and the queen. Accordingly on receiving overtures from them, he expressed his readiness to afford them assistance on certain conditions. He was in a position to make his own terms. His demands were humiliating to France as a nation, but they were readily accepted. Henry was to receive the hand of the Princess Catherine; to be the immediate regent of the kingdom; and to be recognised successor to the crown of France on the death of King Charles. Humiliating as these terms were, when they were announced to the parliament and other authorities of Paris, they were hailed with joy. On a sudden, Henry had become the most popular man in France. The highest eulogiums were paid to his virtues. He was wise and prudent; a lover of peace and justice; a protector of the poor, and a defender of the Church: in a word, everything that a monarch ought to be. Some few nobles considered the treaty disgraceful and destructive to the independence of the nation; but the great majority looked upon it with favour.

This astonishing treaty, by which the crown of France was to be transferred to a stranger, was finally concluded at Troyes, on the 21st of May, 1420. It was said to be a treaty of "perpetual peace;" and parliament, barons, bishops, and people, all vied with each other in the eagerness with which they acknowledged Henry as regent. The oath of allegiance was taken with a readiness truly marvellous. But no one was more loyal to King Henry than the young duke of Burgundy. He gladly did homage to him for his fiefs, and acknowledged him as his future sovereign, in the hope that he would—as Henry had stipulated to do—avenge the death of his father.

The marriage of Henry with the Princess Catherine was celebrated on the 2nd of June, in the church of St. John, at Troyes. Only one day was spent in banqueting, for on hearing of the treaty of Troyes, the dauphin had assumed the style and authority of regent, and had appealed to God and his sword for the maintenance of his title. It was necessary, therefore, for Henry to take the field against him. A tournament was proposed as a prolongation of the marriage festivities, but he would not listen to it. Their enemies, he said, were at Sens, and by laying siege to it they might have jousting and tourneying enough. There, he added, every man might give proof of his prowess; and there was "no finer prowess than doing justice to the wicked, that the poor people might live." Accordingly, on the second day after his marriage, Henry, "regent and heir of France," marched from Troyes to Sens, his bride accompanying him to his wars. Sens was besieged and captured; and Montereau and Villeneuve and Melun successively fell into his hands. Melun was taken on the 18th of November, and as the dauphin had fled into Languedoc, where the party of the young count of Armagnac was powerful, Henry, with his bride, and Charles and the queen, repaired to Paris. All Paris was wild with joy as they paced along its streets. The people were starving, but still they rent the air with loud acclamations. In honour of Henry, the rich assumed the red cross of England, while the priests, ever ready to pay the most fulsome adulations, chanted, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." On their arrival in Paris the three

estates of the kingdom were summoned to meet, and on the 6th of December they unanimously gave their solemn approval of the treaty of Troyes.

By that treaty, and the subsequent victories of Henry, an apparently stable foundation was laid for the union of England and France under one sceptre. Had that union actually taken place, it is difficult to say to which country it would have proved most pernicious. On this subject Hume justly remarks: "It must have reduced the former kingdom to the rank of a province: it would entirely have disjointed the succession of the latter, and have brought on the destruction of every descendant of the royal family, as the houses of Orleans, Anjou, Alençon, Brittany, Bourbon, and of Burgundy itself, whose titles were preferable to that of the English princes, would on that account have been exposed to perpetual jealousy and persecution from the sovereign. There was even a palpable deficiency in Henry's claim, which no art could palliate. For besides the insuperable objections to which Edward III.'s pretensions were exposed, *he* was not heir to that monarch: if female succession were admitted, the right had devolved on the house of Mortimer: allowing that Richard II. was a tyrant, and that Henry IV.'s merits in deposing him were so great towards the English, as to justify that nation in placing him on the throne, Richard had nowise offended France, and his rival had merited nothing of that kingdom: it could not possibly be pretended that the crown of France was become an appendage to that of England; and that a prince who by any means got possession of the latter, was without further question, entitled to the former. So that, on the whole, it must be allowed that Henry's claim to France was, if possible, still more unintelligible than the title by which his father had mounted the throne of England."

The apparent foundation for the union of England and France, however, which had thus been laid, was by Henry's subjects considered to be a cause for rejoicing. *They* looked not to the future, but the present. He had been victorious, and the nation was exalted by his triumphs. In January, A.D. 1421, as Henry had great need of men and money, and as these could only be obtained from his exulting subjects in England, he took shipping with his bride, and came to London. Their reception was one of unusual magnificence. There were such pageants and feasts as had rarely before been witnessed. The general sentiment of the people has been thus expressed by a chronicler of that period. "No doubt," he says, "England had great cause to rejoice at the coming of such a noble prince, and so mighty a conqueror, which in so small space, and so brief time, had brought under his obeisance the great and puissant realm and dominion of France." The glare of victory had blinded the eyes of the people, so that they could not see the ultimate results of such a dream of ambition as that in which this "mighty conqueror" had been indulging. And yet that they might have seen it is clear, for the first statute of the parliament, convened after Henry's return to England, clearly proves that his laurels had been won at the dearest price, the depopulation of the country. Many had perished in the wars, while numbers of English nobles and knights were residing on the estates which Henry had granted during his conquests in Normandy. It is expressly stated that Henry, before he returned to England, went to Rouen to hold a parliament, and that while there, many English nobles and knights did homage to him for lands granted them in France. The English parliament, however, cordially approved of the peace of Troyes, and the commons granted a subsidy of a fifteenth for the continuance of the war, that so the dauphin and his party being subdued, France might become wholly annexed to the crown of England.

Such an annexation was visionary. On the 23rd of February, "the fair lady" Catherine was crowned queen at Westminster, and Henry and his queen soon after set out on a progress through the kingdom. But their progress was brief. When at York news arrived which recalled Henry to France. He had left his uncle, the duke of Exeter, governor of Paris; and his brother, the duke of Clarence, his lieutenant in Normandy. In Paris there had been signs of revolt against the new government. The people wanted bread, and their wants not being supplied, they had become turbulent. The duke of Exeter had even been compelled to employ his archers against them in the streets to preserve order. It was, however, in Normandy chiefly that events had occurred which recalled Henry to his kingdom in prospective. As Anjou recognized the authority of the dauphin, the duke of Clarence invaded that country, in order to reduce it to Henry's sway. He commenced his work auspiciously; but on a sudden his vanguard was surprised by a body of Anjevins, aided by six thousand Scots under the earl of Buchan, and he was defeated and slain. The greater number of his vanguard were either killed or taken prisoners. The English archers afterwards came up and drove the French and the Scots from the field, and recovered the body of the duke, but the defeat which the English had sustained greatly raised the spirits of the dauphin's partizans, and they prepared for a sterner resistance. At this time, indeed, the dauphin had gathered strength in the south, and was advancing towards Paris to overthrow the government as settled by the treaty of Troyes.

Leaving the queen at Windsor, Henry repaired to France with reinforcements, again to fight for its coveted crown. He set sail from Dover with four thousand men-at-arms and twenty-four thousand archers, and on the 12th of June he reached Calais. In his train was the young king of Scotland, who at this period had been sixteen years a captive in Windsor Castle. During that time no effort had been made to release him from captivity, either by treaty or force of arms. On the contrary, the duke of Albany, while regent, anxious to retain the exercise of royal authority, intrigued for his detention in England; and when he died, Murdoch, his son, who succeeded to the regency, followed his father's line of policy. It was Murdoch who had sent the Scots, under his second son, the earl of Buchan, to assist the dauphin in his war with Henry, foreseeing that if the king of England *should* also become king of France, his rule and authority in Scotland would be endangered. It was by the aid of these brave Scots

chiefly that the duke of Clarence was defeated and slain at Beaujé: whence it was said by Pope Martin V., when he heard the news of that victory, that "the Scots were the only antidote to the English." But while affording aid to the dauphin, Murdoch did not declare war against England. That would have been a step fraught with danger to his rule as regent. As a nation, indeed, the Scots did not approve of the aid afforded to the dauphin. Some deemed it expedient that the growing power of Henry might be checked, but others loudly condemned that measure. So divided were the Scottish nobles and knights in their opinion on this subject, that many of them engaged to serve Henry in his contest for dominion, so that Scot became opposed to Scot in that contest. Thus Archibald, earl of Douglas, joined Henry at Dover, with two hundred men-at-arms, and an equal number of archers; and Alexander, Lord Forbes, Alexander de Seton, lord of Gordon, and several Scottish knights, each with a body of Scots, repaired likewise to his standard. It is said that they engaged to fight for Henry out of affection for their young king James, who volunteered to serve in the war, on condition that at the end of three months after their return from France, he should be allowed to revisit Scotland.

On reaching France, Henry marched to Paris, where he was received with great joy. At that time the dauphin was besieging Chartres, while some of his partizans were scouring the country between that place and the capital. On the approach of Henry, who led his army against him, the dauphin raised the siege, and retired before him. He fled beyond the Loire, and took refuge in Bourges, a strong town in Berry, and, after capturing Beaugency and Dreux, the English returned to Paris. No battle had been fought, but a great number of Henry's troops had perished by disease, induced by a want of wholesome provisions. In the meantime, the duke of Burgundy had defeated the dauphinists in Picardy, and had captured some of the dauphin's bravest knights. At the earnest solicitation of the people of Paris, Henry laid siege to Meaux, about thirty miles from the capital. That place was commanded by a chief who spread terror into the surrounding country. The Bastard of Vaurus, as he is called in history, was a devoted partizan of the count of Armagnac, who had been massacred in Paris, and in revenge for his death, every Burgundian and Englishman that fell into his hands was slain without mercy. His partizan warfare was carried on with a ferocity unexampled even in those bloodthirsty days. He appears to have been rather a brigand than a soldier, for the very peasantry were made to feel his vengeance, although *they* sided with neither party. As he scoured the country with his desperate bands, farmers and dealers were tied to the tails of their horses, and carried into Meaux, and if not ransomed they were hanged on an elm-tree outside its walls. Meaux, in which this brigand commanded, was one of the strongest places in France, and it defied Henry's power for seven months, during which time he lost many of his bravest warriors—some by the enemy's artillery, as the earl of Worcester and Lord Clifford, but more by sickness and disease. Meaux surrendered at discretion; and by its conquest the English became masters of all France north of the Loire. The Bastard of Vaurus was hanged on the tree which he had made the instrument of his barbarous executions.

While Henry was prosecuting the siege of Meaux, intelligence arrived that the queen had, on the 6th of December, borne him a son, an event which caused great rejoicings, both at London and Paris. In May, A.D. 1422, Catherine, escorted by the duke of Bedford, landed at Harfleur with her infant, and joined her husband in Paris. The infant prince seemed to be universally regarded as the future heir of both monarchies; but that illusion was quickly dispelled. When the glory of Henry V. had well-nigh reached its summit, it passed away as a dream, and all his mighty projects became as a thing of nought. History affords few more striking illustrations of the mutability of human affairs and the vanity of earthly hopes, than that which marks the end of Henry's dream of dominion.

At this time the dauphin had collected an army of twenty thousand men in the south, which he placed under the command of the earl of Buchan. At the head of this army, and some Scots, Buchan marched from Bourges, crossed the Loire, and having captured the town of La Charitié, descended the right bank of the river, and laid siege to Caen. Henry had for some time been suffering from fistula, a disease which at that time baffled the skill of surgeons; but at the end of July he left Paris to encounter the dauphin's forces. At his approach the dauphin raised the siege, recrossed the Loire, and hastened back to Bourges. But Henry did not reach more than twenty miles from Paris; for while at Corbeille, his strength failed him, and leaving the command of his army to the duke of Bedford, he was carried back in a litter to the Bois de Vincennes, near the capital. Bedford was about to cross the Loire when he was summoned back to attend the deathbed of his brother and king. The end of this warrior-monarch was at hand: Death, that mightiest of all conquerors, was about to claim the victor for his prey. He is said to have exhibited the same composure in view of death as he had always shown in the field of battle: to have expressed no remorse for the blood he had shed, believing still that the crown of France was his by right, and that he had acted in all he had done as an instrument in the hands of Providence. That crown was fast flitting from the head of his father-in-law, and had he lived but two months longer, it would have adorned his brow. Charles, king of France, was dying, and, notwithstanding his recorded philosophical composure, Henry must have felt it hard that he, being in the vigour of his days, should not have been permitted to grasp that sceptre for which he had so long toiled and valiantly fought. But if he was not permitted to obtain the prize, he did all he could in his dying hours to secure it for his infant son. As the duke of Bedford, the earl of Warwick, and other great lords surrounded his dying bed, he abjured them never to make peace with Charles, who called himself the dauphin, till he had resigned all pretensions to the crown of France: and above all, that their swords should never be sheathed unless the duchies of Normandy and Aquitaine were ceded to England in full sovereignty. He exhorted them to cultivate the

friendship of the duke of Burgundy, and warned them not to release the duke of Orleans, or any of the French princes who were taken prisoners at Agincourt. He left the regency of England to his brother, the duke of Gloucester, and that of France to his elder brother, the duke of Bedford; while the care of his son was intrusted to the earl of Warwick. Having expressed his last wishes, which all around him promised to observe, he asked his physicians how long he had to live. He was answered, "Not more than two hours." He had now done with the world, and began to prepare for eternity. It was but a brief season to do that which it is the wisdom of man to be engaged in all the days of his life. The nobles fell back, and his confessor and chaplains gathered around the bed of the dying monarch. They chanted at his direction the seven penitential psalms, and when they came to the passage, "Build thou the walls of Jerusalem," he interrupted them, and observed that "had he wholly subdued the kingdom of France, and restored it to peace and order, it had always been his intention to conduct a crusade to rescue the Holy City from the Saracens." The priests proceeded with their chant, and they had scarcely concluded their pious work, when Henry breathed his last. He died on the last day of August, A.D. 1422, in the thirty-fourth year of his age, and the tenth of his warlike and ambitious reign, leaving a name behind him "to point a moral or adorn a tale."

Henry's remains were brought to England with much funeral pomp. His effigy in wax, apparelled in royal robes, was laid upon the car, around which knights and squires, dressed in black armour, marched mournfully, preceded by priests and heralds, and followed by all the dead king's household. It was thus they traversed from Paris to Calais. The poet Southey has thus aptly depicted this mournful march:—

> —— the long procession passed
> Slowly from town to town; but those who heard
> The deep-toned dirge, and saw the banners wave,
> A pompous shade, and the high torches glare
> In the midday sun, a dim and gloomy light,
> Then thought what he had been on earth —who now
> Was gone to his account.

The mournful cavalcade embarked at Calais for Dover; and the same solemn march as had been witnessed in France, was witnessed from Dover to London. Then came the end of all that was mortal of this warrior-monarch. His funeral obsequies were performed at St. Paul's, and his body was deposited in Westminster Abbey.

Henry V. was one of the most popular monarchs that has ever swayed the English sceptre. He endeared himself to his subjects by his victories, and by his eminent virtues. For although he was undoubtedly ambitious, he had many attractive personal qualities. He was handsome, brave, frank, affable, and generous, and a great lover of justice. The lustre of his character, combined with his renown as a warrior, so dazzled his English subjects, that throughout his reign they were unmindful of the defects in his title to the kingdom. The same qualities also dazzled the French, over whom he hoped to reign. If historians write correctly, *they* also mourned his untimely end. And they had reason, for it is an undoubted fact, that while he triumphed over them, he was never their oppressor. The strict discipline which he preserved in his army throughout his whole career was remarkable. The people of France, indeed, looked upon him as their protector, for he had repressed and punished the violence and exactions of their own lords, a line of policy which greatly contributed to his conquests. As Hume justly observes, "the French almost forgot that he was an enemy; and his care in maintaining justice in his civil administration, and preserving discipline in his armies, made some amends to both nations for the calamities inseparable from those wars in which his short reign was almost wholly occupied." It was, however, in after years that the fruits of his ambition were manifested. He sowed the wind, and those who came after him reaped the whirlwind. France and England suffered while he lived from his lust of power; but it was while he was resting in his cold tomb in Westminster Abbey that they chiefly suffered. As for his infant son, instead of wearing the triple crown of England and France, his misfortunes in life "surpassed all the glories and successes of his father." Henry had fought in the field of battle, and had schemed in the cabinet for that son's dominion and power, but it was all in vain: his regents lost the crown of France which had been bequeathed to him, and after he had assumed the reins of government in England, its crown was torn from his brow by its rightful possessor. But as it has been justly observed, "the career of Henry V. was not without its national benefit;" for "from his time there was no false estimate in Europe of the prowess of the English; from his time, no dream that the proud island might be subjugated." It is, in truth, remarkable, that while the civil wars in France encouraged Henry to claim for himself and heirs the throne of that kingdom, during half a century, in which England was involved in civil wars after the death of Henry, no king of France ever sought to avenge his conquests and pretensions by an attempt to win by the sword the crown of England.

SECTION III.

HENRY VI., SURNAMED OF WINDSOR.

Henry VI., the only child of Henry and Catherine, was scarcely nine months old when his reign commenced. But, although so young, he was treated as a king by the high dignitaries of the realm. While a stately funeral procession was bringing home the remains of his father to be interred in Westminster Abbey, there was a remarkable scene in Windsor Castle. There was a council over which a child in the arms of his nurse was supposed to preside. The great seal was placed in the infant's lap, and his hands were placed upon it, after which it was delivered back, as his act and deed, to an interim chancellor till the parliament assembled. Such was the commencement of the reign of Henry of Windsor.

Parliament met on the 9th of November, A.D. 1422. The duke of Gloucester represented the person of the infant monarch by commission. On his death-bed, the late king had named Gloucester regent of the king-

but though his memory was revered, parlia- did not confirm the dignity. The title of implied too much power to suit the views of ds and commons; and the duke of Bedford, the ng's elder brother, was appointed protector and er of the kingdom: his younger brother, hrey, duke of Gloucester, surnamed the Good, enting him in his absence beyond sea. Still r to limit the power of the protector, a permanent l of sixteen members was appointed, various tions being made, defining their powers and ges. From the rolls of parliament it appears loucester claimed to be regent according to the of his brother; but it was held that the king not grant governance of the land to any person while he lived; and the dukes of Bedford and ster, who were princes of great honour and ity, readily acquiesced in any appointment tended to give security to the realm. As n observes, in this regulation a great constitu- principle was maintained. It was established king could not appoint a regent during the ty of his successor; and that no person could e the royal prerogative during a king's infancy, by the choice of parliament, and under the ions prescribed by it for the conduct of the ive government.

hin two months, the death of Henry of Mon- was followed by that of Charles VI., king of . At the funeral solemnities of that monarch, Denis, the infant Henry was proclaimed by a "king of France and England." But there two kings of France proclaimed. As soon as uphin, who was in Auvergne, received the he was conducted by the knights of his party to chapel, where a banner was raised with the of France upon it, and where he was saluted nder the title of Charles VII. Subsequently solemnly crowned and anointed king of France tiers. France was now, therefore, openly di- between rival monarchs: one, an infant still in ms of his nurse, and the other just grown into anhood. But at this time, the infant Henry r to be the successful rival. He was acknow- in the northern parts of the kingdom, and his ts were supported by the most accomplished of his age, John, duke of Bedford. The whole of England was at Bedford's command, and he the head of armies commanded by renowned ls and accustomed to victory. He had also ion of the capital of France, and of Guienne, ncient inheritance of England. On the other he affairs of Charles were in a reduced condi- He was acknowledged south of the Loire, but no powerful supporters. His ministers were men of great virtues nor great abilities. He f was more addicted to pleasure than to war. h only about twenty years of age, he was d to Mary of Anjou, a princess of great beauty rtue, but he was more devoted to his mistress, Sorrel, than to his queen. He was inclined to ost venial of kingly vices, the pursuit of gal- which unfitted him for feats of arms. Then the duke of Burgundy, whose father he had as his mortal enemy; and the duke of Brittany, one of the greatest vassals of his crown, stood aloof from him. Other princes of the blood, as the dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, and the earls of Eu, Angoulême, and Vendôme were prisoners in England; and no foreign nation had espoused his cause except the Scots. So low had his prospects and resources fallen, that Charles, not without reason, was called by his enemies, in derision from the town in which he chiefly resided, "The little king of Bourges."

Such was the position in which the rival monarchs of France stood at the death of the imbecile Charles VI. To strengthen the English interest in France, early in the year 1423, the duke of Bedford had a meeting with the dukes of Brittany and Burgundy, at Amiens, where they not only swore to love one another as brothers as long as life lasted, but cemented their union by matrimonial alliances. Thus, one marriage was contracted between the duke of Bedford and Anne, youngest sister of the duke of Burgundy, and another between the earl of Richmond and the elder sister of that duke, which marriages were soon after duly solemnized. But notwithstanding all these adverse circumstances, Charles VII. had one advantage, of the existence and value of which he was still ignorant—he possessed the hearts of the people of France, who hated the English, and loved their country.

Before the death of his father, Charles had obtained aid from Scotland. The earl of Buchan had arrived in France with from five to six thousand Scots, and had defeated the English at Beaujé, where the duke of Clarence was slain. So delighted was Charles at this victory, that he created the victorious Scottish earl constable of France. But this success was, after his accession, followed by a signal reverse. An allied army of French and Scots, in July A.D. 1423, laid siege to Crevant in Burgundy: and the earl of Salisbury, marching to its relief with an army of English and Burgundians, a bloody battle was fought in which the earl obtained a complete victory. The Scottish auxiliaries were almost annihilated, but the French basely fled from the field. The loss of his Scottish allies almost ruined the affairs of Charles; but soon after he received auxiliaries from Milan, who, with some French troops, surprised and captured the Burgundian marshal, Toulongian, together with six hundred men. Towards the close of this campaign, also, the French royalists defeated a body of English commanded by Sir John de la Pole, who was taken prisoner with several of his brave companions in arms. But these advantages did not continue. In the spring of A.D. 1424, Charles obtained fresh aid from Scotland. The earl of Buchan had visited his native country, and had obtained a reinforcement of five thousand men from his brother, the regent, with which he and Archibald, earl of Douglas, landed at Rochelle. Altogether the troops, under the banner of King Charles, now amounted to about 18,500 men—seven thousand of whom were Scots, and the rest French and Milanese. In the summer this force, under the count de Narbonne and the earls of Buchan and Douglas, marched to the relief of Ivry, which was besieged by an English army commanded by the earl of Salisbury. Finding that the duke of Bedford had entered the English camp a few days before their arrival, and that it was too strong to be forced, the

combined forces of French, Scots, and Milanese retired, and invested Verneuil in Perche. Ivry was captured, and the duke of Bedford marched to Verneuil to raise the siege or give the enemy battle. On hearing of his approach, the earl of Buchan called a council of war in order to deliberate as to which of the two courses would be the most prudent, to fight or retreat. The wiser part of the council declared for a retreat. They represented that all the past misfortunes of the French had arisen from rashness in giving battle when no necessity compelled them; that this army was the last resource of the king, and the only defence of the few provinces which remained faithful to him, and that every reason invited him to embrace cautious measures which might leave time for his subjects to return to a sense of duty, and give leisure for discord to arise among his enemies, who, being incited by no common band of interest or motive of alliance, could not long persevere in their animosity against him. This was wise council, but it was rejected: honour forbade them, it was urged by the young French noblemen, to turn their backs upon the enemy, and they prepared for battle.

In this action the numbers were nearly equal. The constable, Buchan, drew up his forces under the walls of Verneuil, and resolved to await the attack of the enemy. Had the count de Narbonne adhered to this plan, the result of the battle might have been different. Instead, however, of awaiting the attack of the English, he led his troops forward precipitately, and the whole line was compelled to follow his rash example. The duke of Bedford had drawn up his archers in one line, having, as was their usual custom, their sharp pointed stakes fixed before them. Their arrows committed fearful execution; and seizing his opportunity, the duke of Bedford, at the head of his men-at-arms, rushed upon the French, broke their ranks, and chased them off the field. The victory was complete. The earls of Buchan and Douglas, and many other Scotchmen of rank were slain; and of the French there fell on that fatal day, four earls, two viscounts, eight barons, and three hundred knights, with about four thousand common men. Many also were taken prisoners, among whom was the duke of Alençon and the marshal Fayette. But the battle must have been fiercely contested, for the English left above two thousand men dead on this field of blood. Notwithstanding, this engagement was recorded in the rolls of parliament as "the greatest deed done by Englishmen in our days save the battle of Agincourt."

Charles was now left almost without hope. No town north of the Seine held out against the duke of Bedford, and had he crossed that river there was not an army able to oppose him. At this time, however, the seeds of discord had been sown between the English and their allies, which soon told in his favour. Jaqueline, heiress of Hainault and Holland, had been given in marriage by her feudal guardian, the duke of Burgundy, to the duke of Brabant. It was an ill-assorted union, for Jaqueline was a woman of spirit and beauty, and her husband was a feeble character. Love, if there ever had been any in her heart towards him, was soon exchanged for hatred. She left him, fled to England, and having obtained a nullification of her marriage vow from the anti-pope Martin, she married the duke of Gloucester. The duke of Burgundy was enraged at this step, but the duke of Bedford managed to keep his rage within bounds, as long as the duke of Brabant was left in the peaceable possession of his wife's dominions. But Gloucester did not want Jaqueline without her inheritance. A few weeks after the battle of Verneuil, he suddenly appeared at Calais with five thousand men. It was supposed by the duke of Burgundy that this army was designed to aid in completing the conquest of France: but, instead of this, Gloucester marched into Hainault to take possession of that country. This rash step was in the end fatal to the cause of the infant Henry in France. The duke of Burgundy resented the injury done to the duke of Brabant, his near relation. As Hume observes, he foresaw the consequences which must attend the extensive and uncontrolled dominion of the English, if before the full settlement of their power, they insulted and injured an ally to whom they had already been so much indebted, and who was still so necessary for supporting them in their further progress. Hence he not only encouraged the duke of Brabant to resist Gloucester's pretensions, but he recalled some of his troops from the combined army in France, and sent them, with other forces, to his kinsman's assistance. Hainault became the seat of a new war. And the quarrel soon became personal as well as political. The duke of Gloucester wrote to Burgundy complaining of the opposition made to his pretensions, and in his letter, charged him with a want of truth in these transactions. This charge was resented. The duke of Burgundy demanded its retractation, and when this was refused, he challenged Gloucester to single combat. Bedford foresaw the bad effects of this ill-timed and imprudent quarrel. It left him in a measure powerless. All the succours which he expected from England were intercepted by his brother for the war in Hainault, and the forces of the duke of Burgundy, on which he also depended, were diverted to the same contest. And besides this double loss, he was in danger of losing the friendship of that confederate whom the late king had enjoined him, with his dying breath, to gratify by every mark of regard and attachment. To prevent this dreaded rupture, he laboured earnestly to reconcile the dukes of Burgundy and Gloucester; but all his efforts were vain; his brother's impetuous temper being the chief obstacle to all accommodation. Hence, instead of pushing the victory gained at Verneuil, the duke of Bedford came over to England to endeavour, by his counsels and authority, to moderate the measures of his brother Gloucester.

Some differences among the English ministry also existed, which required Bedford's presence in England. A quarrel had very early commenced between the duke of Gloucester and his uncle, Henry Beaufort, the rich and haughty bishop of Winchester, and at this time it was on the point of producing a civil war. On his return, the duke of Bedford employed the authority of parliament to reconcile them, and these rivals were compelled to promise that they would bury all their quarrels in oblivion. Parliament decided that Gloucester should be "good lord to the bishop, and have him in affection and love;" and that the bishop should bear to the protector "true and

ove and affection, and be ready to do him such service as pertaineth of honesty to my lord of Winchester, and to his estate to do." But this reconciliation was not sincere. The bishop, feeling himself umiliated, resigned the chancellorship, and went broad, where he obtained from the sovereign pontiff he red hat of a cardinal.

Meanwhile the duke of Burgundy continued cold a his alliance with England. Time, however, seemed o open expedients for the renewal of his friendhip. When Gloucester returned to England he left aqueline in Mons, where she was soon after given up y the citizens to the duke, her guardian. She was onducted to Gant in June, A.D. 1426, but in the utumn she made her escape into Holland, where for wo years she sustained a war with her subjects. ut with this war Gloucester had nothing to do, for e was no longer interested in her heritage. A bull ad been procured from the Pope, by which not only aqueline's contract with Humphrey, duke of Glouester, was annulled, but it was also declared that, ven in case of the duke of Brabant's death, it should ever be lawful for her to espouse the English prince. Iumphrey was compelled to submit; and he subsequently consoled himself by marrying his former istress, Eleanor Cobham. The duke of Brabant ied; and before his widow could recover her domiions, she was obliged to declare the duke of Burundy her heir in case she should die without issue, nd to promise never to marry without his consent. t was hoped that this satisfactory termination of the ffair would induce Burgundy to renew his friendship rith England; but the breach could not be permanently healed. It left an impression on his mind hat neither time nor circumstances could efface, and hough he did not yet ally himself with the French ing, he stood aloof from Bedford.

Other allies, however, had openly espoused the ause of Charles. Arthur, earl of Richmond, had een refused the command of the English army, and e went over to Charles, who gave him the office of onstable of France. Gratified by his high dignity, ichmond detached his brother, the duke of Brittany, rom the interests of England. Had Charles been a rise king, he would have taken advantage of the iscord which had for two years prevailed between he English and their allies, by making preparations or the war, when it should be renewed by the duke f Bedford. Instead of this, his shadow of a court vas haunted with petty intrigues and struggles for ower. He could not live without a mistress and a avourite. His favourites ruled, or sought to rule, is nobles, who were too proud to stoop to win the ersonal affections of the monarch. The new constable, above all, could not bear a rival; and Charles, who had no taste for his haughty character, always ffered one to him. But the constable declared war gainst them. He compelled Charles to banish his wo prime favourites, Tannaguy du Chatel and ouvel; and de Giac, their successor, was carried off y his order and drowned. Beaulieu, also, was assassiated at his instigation; but as the king could not xist without a private friend, Richmond provided im with one in the person of Louis de la Tremouille, whom he found to be as troublesome a rival as either of those who had been banished or murdered. These contests with courtly rivals, rendered the new constable odious to Charles, and prevented him doing the service which was expected of him. Hence the military operations in France during the absence of the duke of Bedford, deserve no mention in the page of history.

At length, in the year 1428, the English resolved to strike a blow that should crush the hope of Charles. His chief reliance was upon the possession of Orleans. If that city fell, the provinces of the south which owned his sway would be open to the English, and he would then have to find shelter in the mountains of Auvergne, or the more remote Dauphiné. Orleans was his chief and last stronghold. It was, therefore, against this city that the duke of Bedford directed his efforts. The earl of Salisbury, who was the most renowned warrior of that age, was appointed commander of the English army, and passing the Loire, he made himself master of several places which surrounded Orleans on that side, and then sat down before that city. His design had been penetrated, and great preparations had been made for a stern resistance. The citizens had destroyed their suburbs, with their vineyards, gardens, and houses, that their enemy might have no lodgment, and they erected strong forts, particularly that of the Tournelles, which, defending the bridge, secured the communication of the city with the left bank of the Loire. The bravest captains of Charles also flung themselves into the city for its defence, and every exertion was made for a vigorous and successful resistance. The enterprise undertaken by the English was an arduous one, for Orleans, washed by a broad and rapid river, could not but with great difficulty be invested. The earl of Salisbury, in truth, had not an army sufficient to invest it on all sides, so that from the first his success was doubtful. Notwithstanding, he applied himself to his task with skill and vigour. He made his approaches from the south, directing his chief efforts upon the bulwark of the Tournelles. The assault was resisted with more than usual popular enthusiasm. The French warriors discharged their arrows and missiles, and the citizens, both male and female, showered down stones upon the heads of the assailants. Notwithstanding, at the second assault the fort of Tournelles was captured. But this important acquisition was fatal to the earl of Salisbury. As he was surveying the city from the ruined tower of the Tournelles, he was slain by a stone from an engine. He was succeeded by Lord Suffolk, who undertook the hopeless task of a blockade. A line of redoubts, then called bastiles, was built at certain distances from each other, but not sufficiently close to prevent the ingress and egress of warriors. At the same time, these bastiles being bristled with cannon, so greatly interrupted the communication between the city and the country, that the besieged found great difficulty in procuring provisions. In their attempts to introduce them, there were constant skirmishes, in which many were slain. But still the French defied the utmost efforts of the English to take the city. The cause had ceased to be civil, and had become national—a change that had created heroism and military talent. During this siege the French

displayed unwonted skill and discipline. Their chief heroes were the Bastard of Orleans, La Hire, and Saintraille. These leaders, with John Stuart, constable of the Scots, on one occasion attacked an English convoy sent by the duke of Bedford from Paris under Sir John Fastolffe, for the army before Orleans, but they were routed, and the Scotch, with their commander, were slain to a man. This was in the time of Lent, A.D. 1429, and as the convoy was chiefly of *herrings*, the action is called "The Battle of the Herrings."

Elated by the issue of this action, the English pushed on the siege of Orleans with renewed vigour. Towers and bulwarks were erected on each bank of the Loire, and the lines more vigilantly kept, so that neither food nor men could reach the city. Famine, with all its horrors, threatened its garrison and citizens. At this time the feudal lord of Orleans was in captivity in England; and seeing resistance was unavailing, the people proposed that their city should be placed in the keeping of the duke of Burgundy, till the great contest for the crown of France was decided: till it should be seen whether the country should be governed by the English Plantagenets, or by its own race of Valois. This proposal was communicated to the duke by ambassadors from Orleans, and he was pleased with it. But not so was the duke of Bedford. When the subject was debated between these allied chiefs at Paris, he sternly opposed such a measure. He was not of a humour, he declared, to beat the bushes for another to take the birds. Bedford and Burgundy quarrelled about their expected prey, and the latter withdrew his troops, and left the English to continue the siege alone. Still the English maintained their superiority, and Orleans was on the eve of falling, when a personage, intrusted, as it was believed, with a celestial mission, came to pluck courage from the stout hearts of the besiegers, and to give it, with all the enhancing force of superstition, to the French.

In the village of Domremi, situate near the borders of Burgundy, there was a country girl named Joan of Arc. Her father appears to have been a small farmer, and her chief occupations were to spin by the side of her mother, and tend her father's oxen in the field. The situation of Domremi was such that it compelled its inhabitants to take a deep interest in the question as to whether Henry or Charles should be king of France. The plundering habits of the military had more than once disturbed their peaceful dwellings, and they were naturally anxious that the war should come to an end. Their wishes were strongly in favour of Charles; and Joan very early imbibed their feelings. She was a girl possessed of a devout and enthusiastic temperament. She took her part in the duties of her family, but had little inclination for the sports and amusements of her sex. Her delight was rather to spend her leisure hours in solitude, and to frequent places in the neighbourhood marked by fairy legends or supernatural relations. Her habits of life and thought, indeed, were such that as she grew into womanhood her mind became deeply imbued with feelings which partook of a singular combination of superstition and patriotism. Her state of mind is well depicted by Southey in the following lines, which Joan is supposed to utter:—

I sat in silence, musing on the days
To come, unheeded and unseeing all
Around me in that dreaminess of thought,
When every bodily sense is as it slept,
And the wind alone is wakeful. I have heard
Strange voices in the evening wind, strange forms,
Dimly discovered, thronged the twilight air.
The neighbours wondered at the sudden change,
And called me crazed.
At length I heard of Orleans, by the foe
Wall'd in from human succour: then all thought,
All hopes were turned; that bulwark once beat down,
All was the invaders. Now my troubled soul
Grew more disturbed, and shunning every eye,
I loved to wander where the forest shade
Frowned deepest; there on mightiest deeds to brood
Of shadowy vastness, such as made my heart
Throb loud: anon I paused, and in a state
Of half expectance listened to the wind.

There was an ancient prophecy in France that a virgin could alone rid France of her enemies. At an early period this prophecy had fixed the attention of the maid of Domremi. In her lonely way of life, she pondered so deeply over it until at length her imaginative spirit led her to the conclusion that *she* was the virgin destined to be the saviour of her country. In her solitary meditations, she fancied she saw visions and heard voices. The first voice she heard told her to be pious and discreet; but at length there came to her a figure with wings, commanding her to go to the king and succour him, for that she should recover his kingdom. Joan became firmly convinced that such was her high mission, but how could a poor country girl hope to be placed in a position to accomplish it? Her voices told her. She was to put herself in communication with some high person. Accordingly, she applied to the feudal lord of Baudricourt, at Vaucouleurs. Had not her enthusiasm been of the most extraordinary character, her reception must have effectually damped her ardour. The lord of Baudricourt, on hearing her declare that she had a mission to go and raise the siege of Orleans, and conduct King Charles to be crowned at Rheims, sent her away as one distraught. But Joan's faith in her mission was not shaken by this rebuff. She told her tale to others. There was no help for France, she said, but in her; and though she would rather remain with her poor mother, she must go and succour her king. It was the Lord's will. Her pretensions spread abroad. People began to believe her tale; and when she again appeared before the lord of Baudricourt, in her old red gown, he was induced to furnish her with a horse, and a man's dress, and to provide her with two attendants to conduct her in safety to Charles, at Chinon.

It was in the winter when Joan set out from the little village of Domremi, and after eleven days' travel through a wild country, she reached Chinon. Her fame had gone before her, but neither Charles nor his warriors believed in her mission. It is said that when Charles first heard of it, he burst out into a fit of laughter. It was with some difficulty that she gained admittance into his presence. But his cause was at that time desperate. "The Battle of the Herrings," and the subsequent close investiture of Orleans, had cut off all hope of saving the doomed city. Something must be done at least to inspire courage in the hearts of his warriors. So Joan was

d to an audience. It is recorded that Charles
l aside everything in his dress and apparel
night distinguish him, and that he purposely
l with his courtiers; but that, nevertheless,
h Joan had never seen his face before, she
him out, and indicated to him an acquaintance
cts known only to himself. It seems probable
this stage, however, she had become an instru-
the hands of some persons about the king.
same time every caution appears to have been
o prevent his cause being committed to an
r. Charles himself, although he was in that
hen men grasp at straws, dreaded the ridicule
g credulous, and the danger of meddling with
. Joan poured into his ears the wondrous
t she was commissioned by heaven to raise
ge of Orleans, and to conduct him in triumph
rowned at Rheims; but it was not till his
doctors, sage counsellors, and bold warriors
as their opinion that the maid should be con-
, that Charles yielded to her importunity to
er at the head of his troops. Then she was
l with the rank of a general officer, had a suit
ur made to fit her, and provided with a snow-
harger. It was at Blois that she put on her
, and mounting her war-horse, she led a large
f French warriors charged with a heavy con-
arms, ammunition, and provisions, towards
. She desired that the chiefs of the army
be guided entirely by the dictates of certain
y voices which she said she heard; but they
put confidence in them. They ordered, she
at she should march straight on from Blois by
ht bank of the river; but, knowing that the
the English troops were posted on that side,
verruled the voices, and passed by the left
Joan bitterly complained, but her complaints
heeded. It seems probable, however, that it
have mattered but little as to which side of the
hey proceeded towards Orleans, for at that
of the world's history superstition was the
f men's minds, the great dispenser of hope and
The coming of the maid was expected; and
the French were inspired with an ardour for
the English were impressed with a dread of
ing misfortune. When, therefore, the convoy
hed Orleans, there was but a feeble resistance
o its entrance into the city, and the maid rode
in triumph, amidst the loud acclamations of its
n and citizens.

as on the 29th of April when this aid, believed
upernatural, arrived to the beleaguered city.
was, in effect, saved from that moment, for
vere no longer any efforts made to take the
Five days after, indeed, another convoy of
ns passed into Orleans by the right side of
re, and through the redoubts of the English,
t meeting with any interruption. Among
rave troops, formerly so elated with victory,
rce for combat, there was now no longer a
for battle. A dead silence and astonishment
among them. The hearts of the besiegers,
ecially of the common soldiers, quailed with
d trembling. For two months past they had
f nothing else but this miraculous maid; and
now she had relieved Orleans according to her promise, they conceived that she had given full proof of her divine mission. It was in vain that their leaders endeavoured to convince them that the whole was a juggle got up by their enemies—and talked of the disgrace the dauphin incurred in setting up a low-bred woman as his champion—Joan was still regarded as a minister of vengeance sent from heaven. Finding that they could not revive the courage of their troops by this mode of argument, the English leaders next represented that the maid was not sent from heaven, but from the infernal regions, and that she was a foul sorceress, working by spell and witchcraft. The effect of this made matters even worse. As brave men, they said, they could fight with an earthly enemy, but they could not contest with the powers of darkness. Superstitious fears increased. Strange sights were seen in the clouds, and strange sounds heard by the sentinels at night. Ministers of vengeance were seen on horseback, galloping through the air, and the moon and the stars wandered from their accustomed courses. The superstitious terror which prevailed was attributed to Joan's magic influence, and in order to place themselves out of the reach of it, the allies of the English deserted, and left them to fight their battles alone.

While the English troops were thus overawed, the Maid of Orleans, as she was now called, received a reinforcement from Blois. The French now resumed the offensive. Joan's voices, it was said, told her to go out and fight the English. Suffolk was driven from each of his bastiles or wooden towers successively. One only, that of the Tournelles, commanded by Sir William Gladesdale, made any noted resistance. For a whole day the flower of the French army renewed the assault, but in vain. Joan herself led them, and in the third assault, as she mounted the wall, she was struck by an arrow, and fell as if dead into the ditch by which the fort was surrounded. There were great rejoicings among the English as she disappeared from the ranks of the French. They believed the wound was mortal, but it was not so. For an instant a woman's weakness showed itself. Joan wept; but her paroxysm of sensibility was akin to devotion. Her strength and courage revived. Again she presented herself before the astonished gaze of the English. It was now felt by them that she was in very truth more than human. Panic spread through the camp. Men fancied they saw St. Michael, the archangel and patron saint of Orleans, riding on a white horse, and fighting for the French. Another assault completed the victory. The French became masters of the fort; and in a council of war held in the English camp that night, it was resolved that the siege should be raised.

Orleans was saved; and the general belief was that Joan had, by her victory, proved her mission to be divine. The duke of Bedford himself, though a man of great ability and strengh of mind, appears to have believed in a miraculous cause for the English reverses. In a letter sent by him to the council at London at this time, in which, according to rule, he addresses the young king, he writes: "All things here prospered for you till the time of the siege of Orleans, undertaken of whose advice God only knows.

Since the death of my cousin of Salisbury, whom God absolve, who fell by the hand of God, as it seemeth, your people, who were assembled in great numbers at this siege, received a terrible check. This has been caused in part, as in trow, by the confidence our enemies have in a disciple and limb of the devil, called Pucelle, that used false enchantments and sorcery. The which stroke and discomfiture has not only lessened the number of your people here, but also sunk the courage of the remainder in a wonderful manner, and encouraged your enemies to assemble themselves forthwith in great numbers." Whether Bedford really believed Joan to be a sorceress or not, may be a question; but it was a false policy to decry her as such, for it was the most ready mode he could have adopted to spread terror among his adherents.

Disheartened by their defeat, and dreading the power of the redoubtable maid, the English retired into the castles of which they held possession on the Loire. Suffolk shut himself up in Jargeau, a few miles from Orleans. The government of Charles would have rested inactive under the triumph she had achieved, but Joan felt that her mission was not yet accomplished. She incessantly urged his progress to Rheims, there to be anointed king. She held, indeed, that he was no king till the crown was placed on his brow in that city, where for three centuries all his ancestors had been consecrated. Such a progress seemed impracticable. Rheims was far off, and the way thither was filled with the English. The key of every city from the Loire to the Seine was in their hands; but Joan's bold counsels prevailed. Again her standard was seen floating at the head of a French army. On the 11th of June the heroic maid, with the duke of Alençon and the French chiefs who had defended Orleans, arrived before Jargeau. Suffolk came out with his garrison to give battle; but such was the impetuosity with which the French fought under Joan's command, that he was driven back within its walls. Jargeau was besieged. The siege lasted ten days, and the castle was bravely defended. Joan displayed her wonted intrepidity on this occasion. At the head of her troops she descended into the fosse, and though she received a blow on the head with a stone, which felled her to the ground, she quickly recovered, and in the end the assault was successful. Suffolk was taken prisoner, having first made the Frenchman a knight to whom he gave up his sword.

Meun and Beaugency shared the fate of Jargeau. While engaged in the siege of Beaugency, the constable, Arthur, earl of Richmond, arrived with reinforcements. It was with reluctance that Charles accepted his services, for he had rendered himself odious by the persecution of his favourites; but he was finally permitted to remain, and the army was greatly strengthened by that junction. In the meantime, the duke of Bedford had recovered somewhat from the astonishment into which he had been thrown by these events. He sent a reinforcement of four thousand men, under the command of Sir John Fastolffe, to join the brave Lord Talbot, then at the head of the remains of the English army. The army of Lord Talbot was now so strong that but a few months before the French would not have dared to encounter it. Even now they were doubtful whether it would be prudent. A council of war was held, and the maid of Orleans oracle again prevailed. "In the name of God," she exclaimed, "let us fight the English." "But where," it was asked, "shall we find them?" "March," she rejoined, "and God will be your guide." The two armies met on the 18th of June, at Patay, and the English fled at the terrible banner that had been first unfurled at Orleans. The lords Talbot and Scales were made prisoners. Most of the army fled without striking a stroke, and amongst others the famous Sir John Fastolffe, the hero of "The Battle of the Herrings." His retreat brought upon him the imputation of cowardice, and when he came to the duke of Bedford at Corbeil, he was deprived of the riband of the garter. Fastolffe was one of the bravest of the brave; but he, like the rest of the army, looked upon the maid as a sorceress, and fled from her power.

The onward march to Rheims was now one of unopposed triumph. Charles and his army reached Troyes, and encamped before the town. Troyes was strongly fortified, and the French were without artillery. They were, also, in want of food. Six days of inactivity were spent before Troyes, and it was proposed by some of the French chiefs they should retreat to the Loire. Joan was again consulted. "Assault the town," she exclaimed, "and you shall enter there to-morrow." But there was no assault, for on the morrow, when the famous standard of the maid was displayed, the terrified garrison surrendered the place. In like manner Chalons was captured without resistance. They were now approaching Rheims. As they passed along, the peasants of Joan's native district flocked to look upon her, whom they knew as the shepherdess who had been accounted mad. There was no opposition at Rheims. Before Charles had reached it, the citizens had sent a deputation to him with its keys, and on the 16th of July he made his solemn entry into that ancient city. Here he was solemnly crowned king: the maid of Orleans standing by his side in complete armour, and displaying the banner which had confounded his enemies. When the ceremony was over, she threw herself at the king's feet, and exclaimed: "Now is accomplished the will of God, who would have you come hither to Rheims to receive your consecration, and show that you are the true and rightful king of France."

Although there was no pomp displayed at the coronation of Charles, it was no idle ceremony. From that time the French, even in those parts of the kingdom that were under the dominion of the English, turned their eyes towards him as their lawful sovereign. Laon, Soissons, Chateau, Theirri, Provins, and many other towns in the vicinity of Rheims, immediately after his coronation submitted to him on the first summons, and the whole nation was disposed to give him the most zealous testimonies of their duty and affection. Thus crowned and anointed, he appeared in their sight to have a heavenly commission, and hence had the best right and title to their allegiance.

But Bedford was not disposed to give up the cause of the young King Henry as hopeless. He employed every resource which fortune had left him to protect

terests in France. All the English garrisons put in a posture of defence, and he kept a ful eye over every attempt among the French ls an insurrection. The Parisians were retained edience by alternate caresses and severities. ing that the duke of Burgundy's alliance was y sought by Charles, he prevailed upon that to come to Paris, and renew his alliance with nd. On the very day that Charles entered is, the duke of Burgundy left Paris to collect to aid the English. From England few or no rcements could be obtained. During his greatest sses, the English parliament would not grant sup- or his aid; and men enlisted slowly, or soon de- by reason of the accounts which had been spread l of the wonderful power which that wicked ess, the maid of Orleans, possessed. It was for- for him that his uncle Henry, bishop of Win- r, and cardinal of England, arrived at this junc- at Calais, with five thousand men which he was cting to Bohemia, on a crusade against the tes. He was persuaded to lend these troops to phew, and with an equal number raised in Nor- and Picardy, the duke of Bedford took the o oppose Charles, who was advancing with his to the gates of Paris.

ring seen Charles crowned at Rouen, the maid of is thought her mission accomplished. That was y-dream of her life, and she desired now to return native village, once more to spin by the side of other; to attend her father's cattle; and to fre- the fairy haunts of Domremi. But Charles would ten to her desire. As she had conducted him in ph to Rheims, he fancied that she would be able duct him with equal triumph to Paris. The yielded to his wish; but happy had it been for she had returned to the scenes of her childhood outh. For a time, however, all went "merry as riage bell." She herself had lost all confidence voices: but her wonderful standard had not yet s potency. Town after town surrendered as s marched from Rheims towards Paris, and his s was ascribed entirely to the wonderful maid eans. Among other places, he had made himself r of Compeigne, Beauvais, Senlis, Sens, Laval, , and St. Denis. Near Senlis the two armies in sight; but when they had faced each other ays, they separated without a battle. It was olicy of Bedford not to give battle, but at the ime boldly to face his enemy, in order to restore urage of his troops. His posts were chosen so much caution, that it was impossible for s to attack him with any advantage, and yet he imself in a posture to reap advantage from any tep his adversary might take. At length each took its own way. Charles went to Bourges, rdinary place of his residence, and Bedford ed to Normandy, to oppose the earl of Rich- who had made an inroad into that province. absence Charles made an attack on Paris. But as too hardy an enterprise. In an assault upon ate and boulevard, St. Honoré, Joan was led, and the French were obliged to retreat. In tack on Paris, the intrepid maid displayed her d courage, but the old confidence in her powers had deserted the French. She had told them they should sleep that night in Paris, and when they re- proached her with the failure of the assault, she re- replied that they "would have slept there if they had fought as she fought." Charles retreated to the Loire, and he spent the succeeding winter at Bourges. Joan again expressed a desire to return to Domremi, but Charles could not part with his heroine. He lavished honours on her and her family; and flattered by his generosity, Joan was induced to remain and fight for her king.

Having compelled the earl of Richmond to evacuate Normandy, Bedford returned to Paris. He was joined there by the duke of Burgundy, who in order to keep him steady in his alliance with England, was con- stituted governor of Paris, and regent for King Henry of all the provinces of France except Normandy. In the spring of the year 1430, the duke of Burgundy laid siege to Compeigne. Charles advanced from the Loire to its relief. At that time he had two oracles in his camp; for another miraculous woman had made her appearance at Bourges, whose inspiration was of a financial character. Catherine of La Rochelle laid claim to a faculty of recognizing at a glance all persons who had concealed treasures, and she pro- mised Charles, who was in great need, abundance of money. Joan and Catherine became rivals. When consulted as to the measures best to be adopted their opinions widely differed. Joan asserted that peace lay at the end of the lance; but Catherine maintained that the pen was the most potent instrument for con- quest. She advised Charles not to fight, but to nego- tiate with the duke of Burgundy. But Joan's oracle prevailed, and the war recommenced. Her exploits, however, were drawing to a term. It is said that she herself was aware of this, and that she hinted her career would soon be over. The duke of Burgundy, and the earls of Arundel and Suffolk, laid siege to Compeigne, and Joan bravely fought her way into the town to aid in its defence. The garrison now believed themselves to be invincible. But their joy was of brief duration. The day after her arrival she headed a sortie upon the quarters of John of Luxem- bourg. Twice she drove the enemy from their en- trenchments; but as their numbers were continually increasing, she ordered a retreat. Being hard pressed by the pursuers, she turned upon them, and made them more than once stand at bay. At length, how- ever, being surrounded and deserted by her friends, she yielded herself prisoner to the Burgundians. It was the common opinion that the French officers, who had long been jealous of her renown, and the favour in which she was held by Charles, basely exposed her to the power of her enemies; enemies who had de- clared their intention, whenever they could catch her, of treating her as "a foul witch."

The joy of the English and Burgundians at the capture of the heroic maid was unbounded. Greater could not have been displayed if they had captured the whole French army. The camp resounded with loud reiterated acclamations. In Paris the service of Te Deum, so often profaned by princes, was solemnly celebrated. Bedford conceived that by her captivity he should recover his former ascendant in France. To insure her destruction, therefore, he purchased her

of John of Luxembourg, who commanded the Burgundian army at Compeigne, and she was conducted to Rouen, where, loaded with irons, she was thrown into a dungeon. She lay in prison for several months, while her enemies were contriving the mode of proceeding against her in order to secure her condemnation.

As a prisoner of war, the heroic maid was entitled to be treated with courtesy, and either to be exchanged or ransomed. By no act during her victorious career had she forfeited the right to be treated according to the usages of civilized warfare. In her military capacity, she had neither displayed treachery nor cruelty. No civil crime could be laid to her charge; and when messengers were sent to her native village to investigate the actions of her youth, the innocency of her life was made fully manifest. Throughout her life at home and in the camp, she had obeyed "her voices,"—she had been "pious and discreet." The virtues and the decorum of her sex had been rigidly observed. True, she had placed herself at the head of armies, which might appear to have been irregular; but instances of female generalship had been known in history, and applauded by the world. And even if it had been irregular, the signal services she had rendered to her prince had not only compensated for the irregularity, but had entitled her to praise and admiration. Bedford himself seems to have been aware of all this, for in order to insure her destruction, he found it necessary to interest religion in some way in the prosecution. It was under that cloak he sought shelter to justify his injustice and inhumanity.

Joan was captured within the diocese of Beauvais, the bishop of which was wholly devoted to the English interest. He presented a petition against her, desiring to have her tried for sorcery, impiety, idolatry, and magic. The university of Paris, also, was mean enough to urge her trial before an ecclesiastical tribunal. At length letters patent were issued in the name of the youthful Henry VI., in which it was stated that in accordance with the public opinion, and at the request of the bishop of Beauvais, and the university of Paris, she was to be given up to the bishop to be examined and prosecuted under his authority. With the bishop in this infamous prosecution, sat brother Martin, vicar-general of the Inquisition, and certain doctors of the canon law. All her judges were zealous in the English interest, and were determined if possible to find her guilty. For several months she was subjected to the most searching interrogatories. Alone and undismayed she stood before her judges. Every question asked was answered by her with perfect frankness. During fifteen succeeding sessions, in which questions of the most artful and ensnaring character were put to her, no word fell from her lips of which they could take advantage. The point upon which her judges most insisted, were her visions and revelations and intercourse with departed saints. She was asked if she would submit the truth of these inspirations to the Church? Her reply was, she would submit them to God, the fountain of truth. When asked why she put trust in her standards which had been consecrated by magical incantations? She replied that her trust was in the Supreme Being alone, whose image was impressed upon it. They demanded why she had displayed that standard at the coronation of Charles, at Rheims? She answered that the person who shared the danger was entitled to share the glory. When accused of going to war, wearing men's clothes, and bearing arms contrary to decorum, she boldly averred that her sole purpose was to drive the English out of France. In the end, Joan was condemned for all the crimes of which she had been accused, aggravated by heresy; for, by declaring that she would submit her inspirations to God rather than to the Church, was held to be full proof that she was a heretic, and when she appealed to the Pope, he rejected her appeal.

The heroic maid was condemned to die. She was sentenced to be delivered over to the secular arm. The prospect of death in such a manner overcame her fortitude. The punishment of fire was to be her doom. Such was the sentence which was ratified by the university of Paris, and which was read to her by the bishop of Beauvais on a public scaffold at Rouen. Hope of mercy, however, was held out to her if she would recant. What was Joan to do? She had fulfilled her mission, and life was sweet to her. She had long desired to go to her native village, to spend there the remainder of her days. Her parents, too, she felt desired to have the comfort of her presence in their old age. Her death perchance might break their hearts. So Joan's heroic courage in this hour of her extremity failed her. She recanted. She acknowledged the illusion of those revelations which the Church had rejected, and subscribed with the sign of the cross a solemn promise never more to wear man's apparel or bear arms. But even now there was no mercy for her. She was never to revisit the scenes of her youth. She was to live in perpetual imprisonment, fed only on bread and water. Surely, by this time, enough was done to fulfil all political views, and to convince both the French and English that the opinion of divine influence, which had so much encouraged the one, and daunted the other, had no foundation in truth. But her enemies were not satisfied with the victory they had obtained. Possibly their proneness to superstition might lead them to believe that, while the wonderful maid was living, there was danger to their cause: that the bolts and bars of her prison-house might not be able, with all the vigilance of her keepers, to retain her in security, and that she might reappear on the scene of strife, and once more lead King Charles forward to victory. Or it may be that her desired recantation was simply a trap to insure her destruction. At all events, there was a depth of design in these transactions, which must ever, in the page of history, consign all those who were engaged in them to infamy and shame. When Joan recanted, she was, as it is recorded, supplied with her natural habiliments, a woman's apparel; though it is difficult to conceive how she could have been suffered for so long a time after her capture, to have worn the dress of a warrior. But so the story reads. The female dress she had consented to wear is said to have been disagreeable to her, and a suit of men's apparel was purposely placed in her apartment, in order to see whether she would be tempted again to put on that garb. Other accounts say that her female garments were taken away under cover of the night, and a man's dress substituted for it, so that she had no alternative

ut to clothe herself in some portion of it to cover her akedness. Both these stories, however, may be mere iction. It is more than probable that her keepers were nduced, by fee or reward, to swear falsely they had seen er in men's clothes, in order to insure her destruc-ion. At all events, it was on that miserable charge, whether true or false, that Joan was finally condemned o die. As a relapsed heretic, she was delivered by the Church to the secular arm to put the sentence of death into execution.

On the 20th of May, in the old market-place of Rouen, there was a pile of wood heaped high, around which a scaffold was erected. On that scaffold sat bishops and nobles. There sat Cardinal Beaufort and the bishop of Beauvais; and there also sat many a warrior who had fled for fear from the pale and trembling girl whose death they had assembled to witness. As she stood before them, a priest mounted a pulpit, and preached a sermon which set forth her atrocities. There was no word of comfort or hope poured into the ears of the helpless victim. Her character was painted in the blackest colours, and as the lying priest concluded, he hypocritically exclaimed, "Joan, go in peace: the Church can no longer protect thee, and delivers thee into secular hands." Joan was dragged to the pile, the fatal cap of the Inquisition, whereon the words, "hérétique, relapse, apostate, idolâtre," was placed on her head; the fire was kindled, and Joan died "a blessed martyr" in her country's cause, calling on the name of Jesus to her latest moment. Both English and French shared in the infamy of this dark deed; and the court of Rome, having put its seal of approval on the proceedings, was not guiltless of her blood.

The cause of the English was by no means advanced by the death of the heroic maid of Orleans. The cause of their late reverses had been destroyed, but the impulse had been given, and this crime of base vengeance could not stay it. It was in vain that Henry VI. had been brought to Paris in the previous December and crowned at Nôtre Dame. By this act Bedford hoped to revive the declining state of his affairs; but although those vassals of the crown who lived within the provinces possessed by England, wore a new allegiance and did homage to the young king, it had no effect. The ceremony was gorgeous but fruitless. The vast sums expended by England, some of which were even raised by pawning the jewels of the crown, were thrown away. And yet on Henry's return, in February, 1431, he entered London amidst as profuse and laboured pageantry as had welcomed his father when he returned from the field of Agincourt. But he came back from France under different auspices. Dressed up in the mantle of royalty, and with the crown on his head, although only ten years old, he was to perform the character of king. His natural guardians had long been quarrelling for supremacy; and while yet an infant he had been brought into the House of Lords and seated on the throne on his mother's knee, with the view of diminishing the influence of the protector, and it was with a similar view that he was now made publicly to ride through the streets of London in his twofold character of king of England and France. But this royal boy—the son of a hero—was ill fitted for the crown of either country, for he was spiritless and unpromising, and while he soon lost one crown, the other sat uneasy on his brow through life.

The course of events was adverse to the maintenance of a continental dominion. Such were the disordered state of affairs in England, that neither money nor any considerable reinforcements were sent to the duke of Bedford to aid him in his enterprise. During the year in which the heroic Maid of Orleans perished at Rheims, the war languished. The siege of Compeigne was raised, and Ligny was thrice besieged in vain. The year 1432 was equally unmarked by any notable military event. Both nations were exhausted so much by this long and bloody warfare, that neither could bring any considerable army in the field. Hence they were chiefly employed in taking each other's towns and castles by surprise, and in predatory excursions from their several garrisons. Thus, in the spring of the year, Chartres was surprised by the French, and Montargis by the English, while the open country in the provinces north and south was plundered, by which the people were reduced to the greatest distress. France, indeed, suffered more from this irregular mode of warfare than it had done during more decisive conflicts, and Charles seemed regardless of the fate of his country. But during this year an event happened which, in the end, told greatly in his favour. In November the duchess of Bedford, sister to the duke of Burgundy, died, and her death dissolved the chief tie between her brother and her husband. Ann of Burgundy had hitherto preserved some appearance of friendship between them; and had Bedford been prudent he might have preserved it, at least, for some time longer. In the month of January, 1433, however, he married Jacquetta of Luxembourg, daughter of the earl of St. Pol, without asking Burgundy's consent, as he ought to have done; Jacquetta being his vassal. Burgundy complained of this want of courtesy, adding, that by marrying so soon after the death of his sister, he had shown a shameful disrespect to her memory, and to all her family. Bedford's pride could not brook this rebuke, and he resented it the more sharply because he knew that the duke of Burgundy had, since his wife's death, received envoys from Charles courteously. There was an open breach between them; and although some attempts were made at reconciliation by Cardinal Beaufort, they were of no avail. Beaufort prevailed upon them to meet at St. Omers to settle the dispute; but on their arrival neither of them could be prevailed upon to make the first visit, and they departed without meeting, in mutual discontent. Bedford, it is said, afterwards repented that he had allowed his pride on this occasion to overcome his prudence; but it may be questioned whether if they had met a reconciliation would have been effected, for it seems certain that Burgundy had almost come to terms with King Charles, and that he was glad of a pretext for quarrelling.

It was natural that the duke of Burgundy should think of re-espousing the interest of France, for his own interest was bound up in its welfare. Revenge for the murder of his father alone had caused him to ally himself with the English, and dearly had his

country paid for that alliance. Tens of thousands of Frenchmen had been swept to their graves by the war and the famine and pestilence which had attended it since that fatal tragedy on the bridge of Montereau. As for Charles, who had been too deeply concerned in that tragedy, he had bitterly atoned for it. At times he had been reduced to the condition of a vagabond and beggar, and his capital and kingdom had been occupied by his hereditary enemies. If France was to be saved, therefore, from the power of England, it was time that the king and the powerful duke of Burgundy became reconciled. The union of the crowns of England and France on the same head was repugnant to the interests of the house of Burgundy. By that event, its dukes would have been reduced to the rank of petty princes, and their situation would have been dependent and precarious. Besides, the title of the crown of France, after the failure of the elder branches, might fall to the lot of the house of Burgundy, and by the treaty of Troye that title had been sacrificed. In his cooler movements, therefore, when the passion of revenge was allowed to subside, the duke of Burgundy must have seen that it was to his interest to aid in setting that treaty aside. For some years, indeed, the duke had appeared sensibly to relent in his animosity against Charles, and to listen to oft-repeated apologies made by him for the murder of his father. Charles urged his extreme youth when that crime was committed; that he was not then able to judge for himself; that he was then under the control of his ministers; and that he had not the power to resent the deed which he declared had been perpetrated without his knowledge by those under whose guidance he was then placed. Further, to soften the long-cherished resentment of the duke, Charles banished from his court Tannaguy du Chatel and all those who were concerned in the tragedy, and offered to make any atonement required of him. On the other hand, the duke of Burgundy had often, and not without cause, been offended by the haughty conduct of his English allies; and the recent ill-treatment he conceived he had received at the hands of the duke of Bedford, stung him to the quick. All these circumstances gradually abated his aversion to Charles, and his attachment to the English; and finally, at an interview with his brothers-in-law, the duke of Bourbon and the constable Richmond, at Nevers, he determined to unite himself to the royal family of France, to which he was by birth allied. He affected some scruples of conscience as to breaking the solemn oaths which bound him to the English; but when it was suggested that the Pope would remove this difficulty, his scruples vanished, and he consented to the general mediation of the Church of Rome, which from time to time during this long conflict between France and England had sought, but in vain, to promote a peace.

For this purpose a grand European congress was held at Arras, A.D. 1434. It was promoted by Pope Eugenius IV., who entered heart and soul into the business. It is related that the duke of Burgundy insisted that the English should be invited, urging that he had solemnly engaged not to make peace without their participation. Confident in the legality of their claims, and not doubting that Pope Eugenius would be impartial, the English consented to send representatives to the congress at Arras. Cardinal Beaufort and twenty-six lords, half of whom were English and half French, were the representatives of England. King Charles sent twenty-nine commissioners, at the head of whom were the duke of Bourbon and the constable Richmond. All the nobility of the states of Burgundy were summoned. The Pope sent the cardinal of St. Croce as his representative, and the great council of Basil was represented by the cardinal of Cyprus. There were also present ambassadors from the emperor Sigismund, from the kings of Castille, Arragon, Portugal, Navarre, Naples, Sicily, Cyprus, Poland, and Denmark, and from the dukes of Brittany and Milan. It was such a splendid assemblage as Europe had never before witnessed; and after much feasting and entertainment, with jousts, and tournaments, and mysteries, at the expense of the duke of Burgundy, the diplomatists proceeded to business.

It was on the 20th of August that the first session of this memorable congress was held. It was opened by the two cardinals, who acted as mediators, each of whom made a speech on the duty of Christian nations to live in harmony with one another. They earnestly recommended that the belligerent powers should be moderate in their demands, so that a lasting and honourable peace might be concluded. But it soon appeared that there would be no peace. Very early in the session it became evident that the Pope was not impartial, for his representative exhibited a strong bias in favour of King Charles. On behalf of Charles, the French plenipotentiaries proposed to cede to the king of England the provinces of Normandy and Guienne, to be held by homage of the crown of France, on condition that Henry should renounce all pretensions to that crown, and give up all the other places he possessed in the kingdom. It could hardly be imagined that they expected such a proposition would be accepted, for it was for the crown and kingdom itself that the English had for years been contesting. To give them up, therefore, on such terms, when as yet the English remained masters of Paris and many of the best provinces of France, would have been a humiliation too deep for the English nation to endure. Cardinal Beaufort haughtily rejected the proposal as an insult. No answer was made to it, and disavowing the authority of the congress, he and his co-plenipotentiaries retired from the congress and from Arras. But this step appears to have been imprudent. By remaining they might have had some influence in the congress by which the interests of England would have been somewhat protected; whereas, by their abrupt departure, the duke of Burgundy had a plausible pretext for utterly withdrawing his alliance from England, and making a separate peace with France. In their absence those who remained had it all their own way, and especially the duke of Burgundy. He entered into a treaty with Charles greatly to his own interest. Charles had expressed his willingness to make the most ample atonement for past offences, and Burgundy kept him to his word. All the towns beyond the Somme were ceded to him, and he was exempted from all homage towards the king of France. In a

ward, everything Burgundy could desire he obtained and it became his boast that he had forced his sovereign to an *amende honorable*.

There were great rejoicings in France when this peace was proclaimed; but different feelings were expressed when the news reached England. The most violent indignation was excited against the duke of Burgundy, and bitter reproaches were heaped upon him for the breach of his alliance. His peace with Charles was made known by a herald who was treated with contumely. By way of insult the council assigned him a lodging in the house of a shoemaker, and he was sent back to his lord without an answer. It is doubtful indeed if Gloucester had not given him guards to protect him, whether he would ever have returned to the Continent, for the rage of the Londoners knew no bounds. So much were they enraged that the Flemings who resided in London were universally plundered, and some of them were even murdered. But these violences were ill-timed, for they afforded Burgundy a pretence for the further measures which he intended to take against the English. He had for a long time been wavering in his friendship; henceforth he became an implacable enemy.

The treaty of Arras was signed on the 21st of September. The duke of Bedford did not live to hear of that result of this memorable congress. Seven days before he died at Rouen, and was buried there in the cathedral. His death was unfortunate at this critical period. From the very commencement of the reign of Henry VI., the council of England was divided into two parties; the one headed by the duke of Gloucester, and the other by the cardinal of Winchester. On no one subject could these rivals entirely agree. Parliament had made them swear peace and amity towards each other, but they were still foes at heart. There was no union in their councils. Gloucester desired to exert the power of England to redeem the losses and disgraces which had been endured for the last six years; Beaufort advocated, and perhaps more wisely, terms of peace. During their quarrels on this subject all opportunity for a successful struggle passed away. In the end, the duke of York was appointed successor to the duke of Bedford, but it was seven months before his commission passed the seals; and, in the interval, Paris and almost all the other places of strength belonging, or in the possession of the English, were lost, being either purchased or captured by the enemy.

After the return of his herald from London, the duke of Burgundy declared war against the English. Troops were sent by him to aid Charles, and he made great preparations for the siege of Calais. It was through his influence that Paris was lost. He induced the Parisians to forget their old quarrel with the Armagnacs, and declare for Charles; and in the month of April, A.D. 1436, they opened their gates to the famous Burgundian chief, L'Isle Adam. The English garrison, thus surprised and betrayed, capitulated. Meulan, Pontoise, and other places on the Seine, were taken by the troops of Charles, as was Dieppe in Normandy. Insurrection against the power of England became general. In this state of affairs the duke of York appeared in France to recover the lost honour of England. He was scarcely a man to be trusted, for he entertained views upon the English crown; nor were the troops he led the best fitted for the enterprise. The dazzling visions of conquest and glory with which the English had once been excited had passed away. Men were no longer eager to fight for the crown of France, nor was the English government in a condition to pay them well for fighting. Hence the reinforcements with which the duke of York landed in France were chiefly drawn from the lower classes, and not from the hardy and respectable ranks of English yeomen as heretofore. Nevertheless, they were not soldiers to be despised. On his arrival, the duke of York pushed on the war with considerable vigour. Several places which had been taken by the enemy were recovered. The brave lord Talbot was the soul of the English army. He reduced the revolted towns in Normandy, defeated a French army near Rouen, and towards the end of the year, retook the strong town of Pontoise. His energy was such that the English cleared the whole country round Paris, and at one time the capital itself was in danger.

Meanwhile the duke of Burgundy had laid siege to Calais—the only place which now gave the English any sure hold of France, and still rendered them dangerous. He invested that place with an army formidable in numbers, but without experience, discipline, or military spirit. On the first alarm of this siege, the duke of Gloucester, at this time the head of the Council, made preparations for the relief of Calais. A fleet of five hundred vessels was collected, and an army of fifteen thousand men raised for the enterprise. Previous to setting out on his expedition, Gloucester had sent a challenge to Burgundy, telling him that if he would wait, he would fight him and his whole army outside the walls of Calais as soon as the wind would permit him to reach it. But, Burgundy did not wait the event of a battle. Having been foiled in some attempts on Calais, before Gloucester's arrival he raised the siege with great precipitation, leaving his artillery, and engines of war, and an enormous quantity of baggage behind him. Gloucester arrived four days after his retreat, and he followed him into the heart of Flanders, burning, destroying, and plundering, wherever he came without meeting with the slightest show of resistance. Gloucester returned to Calais, and from thence to England with immense booty.

The war with England was not popular with the Flemings. They were more expert in manufactures than in arms. On account of their loss in trade, they were, indeed, upon the very verge of revolt. The inhabitants of the towns on the Somme, also, who had been placed under Burgundy's rule by the treaty of Arras, were greatly disaffected towards his government. Before he had declared war against England, Amiens had rebelled against him; and many of his lords had declined taking any share in the war, partly from fear of its consequences, and partly from scruples arising from their having sworn fealty to Henry. After his miserable failure in the siege of Calais, the Flemings became still more averse to the war with England. Frequent insurrections occurred among them, so that the duke of Burgundy could afford but little aid to his new allies. Dreading the further resentment of the English for his attempt on Calais, he implored Charles to collect all his forces and make

the most vigourous efforts against their common enemies, promising to favour his operations by a diversion on the side of Normandy. At his earnest entreaty Charles roused himself from his habitual indolence. In the spring of the year he took the field in person, and besieged and captured several places. But Burgundy himself was not so successful. In October, his generals invested Crotoy, in the neighbourhood of Crecy, while the duke, at the head of an army, lay near to prevent its being relieved. The gallant Talbot having collected a small army of five thousand men marched towards Crotoy. Having reached the Somme, he found the duke of Burgundy on the opposite bank ready to dispute his passage. Fired with indignation against that prince, Talbot and his troops plunged into the river, and the Burgundians fled without striking a blow. The siege of Crotoy was raised, and Talbot made an incursion into Picardy and Artois, burning and plundering the country, and then returned into Normandy. From this time the duke of Burgundy took but little part in the war; for the subjects of all his states complained that they were beggared by it, and he wisely withdrew from the contest.

Faction still prevailed in the council of England. In July the duke of York was recalled, and the earl of Warwick was appointed to the difficult command. Warwick landed in Normandy in the autumn with a reinforcement of a thousand men, and York returned to England. At this time both France and England were suffering from pestilence and famine, which swept away great numbers of their inhabitants. Many of the provinces of France, also, were infested by bands of robbers, consisting of soldiers of fortune, who, not being able to obtain their pay, committed the most fearful ravages. These calamities produced an almost total cessation of hostilities in the year 1438. In April of that year Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, died, and the duke of York again became regent. But the war still languished. In the year 1439 an attempt was made to bring about a peace, but it proved abortive. A conference was held between the plenipotentiaries of England and France at a place equidistant from Calais and Gravelines; but as the English insisted on the possession of Normandy and Guienne without homage, and the French insisted on their holding them by homage, the conference broke up without effect. One of the most active participators in the attempt to bring about a peace was the duchess of Burgundy, daughter of John of Portugal, and grand-daughter of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. But this congress was not without its fruits, for a truce was concluded between the king of England and the duke of Burgundy through the mediation of his duchess, and became necessary for the mutual subjects.

The struggle between continued. It was, however, both belligerents. It consisted desultory enterprises. In the Richmond, constable of France, and Meaux, despite the attempts to relieve it. The next piracy in France: Louis dukes of Bourbon plotting for the dethronement of his father, the commotion caused by this event ordered Picardy with one army commanded by the carl of Somerset invested Harfleur, the first conquest Fifth, which eight years before had the English. Harfleur was strongly garrison and inhabitants made Having compelled his son, the conspirators to make submission army to its relief. The gallantry never more signally displayed. There was a brave garrison attacked in the rear by superior were at the same time assailed which lay in the river and French were repulsed with Harfleur once more fell into

The war had now, after years. It was said by Comines carried off more men than in the two countries. The was the seat of war, was were laid waste and left cities, also, were almost desired peace, and the hostilities which decided desirous of that blessing were again set on foot. and the demands of both each other, that all attempts fruitless. The English restitution of all the provinces annexed to England, and Calais and its district homage on the part only offered part of Calais, loaded with Neither of the two the war continued.

At the commencement Agincourt, five princes prisoners by the English given England a But at this time those princes had The only remaining Negotiations had his deliverance his party favourable ter and his advocates urged that it none of the French son should be in his own hands but the cause the English duke's delay ratification, but it was a cardinal to of the cause offered 50 sum was ordinary

had been held
reign of Henry
by the dauphin of
three estates in
doubt Gloucester
measure, but his
ced for ever. In
was called, not at
rs were devoted to
ut at Bury St. Ed-
vourite was in the
the knights were
Suffolk collected his
neighbourhood of the
his castle of Devizes
no danger. On the
d thither, surrounded
re was danger in store
broad by the courtiers
conspiracy to kill King
on the throne; and on
and thrown into prison.
ster was arrested on the
28th of the same month
d. It was reported that
ut the whole nation came
ad been most foully mur-
body was shown to the
nd's no marks of violence
ther murdered princes had
n the same manner before,
murderous hands of their
could not be made to believe
ral death. Indeed few, from
to the present time, have ever
a victim to the vengeance of
his political rivals. Subse-
tainers were seized, and accused
s in his treasons, and they were
anged, drawn, and quartered; but
only half hanged, they were cut
as the executioner was proceeding to
Suffolk produced the royal pardon, and
covered to life. The reason given by
his barbarous mercy was, "that the king
cradle had a singular veneration for the
and immaculate Virgin, the mother of God,"
at as the Feast of Assumption was near at hand,
pardoned them and others who had conspired to
prive him of his crown and his life. But no proof
was ever given of a conspiracy; and all the world
believed in their innocence, and in the guilt of those
who had condemned them and afterwards procured
their pardon.

If any proof was wanting to establish the innocence of "the good Duke Humphrey," it might be found in the after-conduct of Queen Margaret and the marquis of Suffolk. Like Ahab, who, when Jezebel had procured the murder of Naboth, greedily seized his coveted vineyard, they hastened to lay hands on all the estates of the deceased duke, Suffolk having the and the rest being distributed among No opposition was made to their plunder; left no legitimate children, and Dame not, on account of her conviction, claim

being apprised of it—probably by the Cardinal Beaufort, who feared to have a queen in Gloucester's interest—fell upon the earl, reduced his whole country, and took him and all his family, except his eldest son, prisoners. Meanwhile the English, unable to make head against Charles in the south, endeavoured to create a diversion in the north of France. Picardy and Anjou were overran by them, but no important conquests attended their operations. Towards the close of the year, Talbot, who had been created earl of Shrewsbury, besieged Dieppe; but the dauphin appearing at the head of a considerable army, the English were obliged to retire. Military operations of a similar character and attended with similar results marked the campaign of A.D. 1443. There was no decisive battle, and no important conquest made by either party. On the whole the French had the advantage, and Charles was gradually consolidating his power; but neither kingdom was in a position to dictate terms to the other. So greatly had both nations suffered from this long and destructive war, that they became the objects of universal pity. Almost all the princes and states of Europe laboured to procure peace between them; and no one was more zealous in the cause of peace than the duke of Orleans, who at this time had regained the confidence of his sovereign. The truce with Burgundy had now expired, but it was this year renewed by the duchess in the name of her husband for an indeterminate time. There was an anxious desire, both in England and France, that either a peace or a truce should be concluded between the two kingdoms. Cardinal Beaufort especially counselled an accommodation, urging, for that purpose, the great disorder in which the English affairs in Normandy were involved, and that the progress made by the French king rendered it impossible to push further the conquests in that kingdom, especially as parliament was niggardly in its supplies toward the support of the war. He further urged that it would be wise to come to an accommodation if only for a season, as it might give room for time and accidents to operate in favour of the English. The duke of Gloucester opposed his views; but at length the cardinal's influence prevailed. William de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, a nobleman strongly attached to the cardinal's party, was despatched to Tours to negotiate: to settle the terms of a perpetual peace if possible, if not to conclude a long truce. Peace between the French and English was not yet attainable. The demands on either side proved irreconcilable. On the 28th of May, however, A.D. 1444, a truce was concluded which was to continue from that time to April 1, A.D. 1446; and by subsequent treaties this truce was prolonged to April 1, 1450. The numerous disorders under which the French government laboured induced Charles to assent to a truce, and the same motives engaged him to consent to its prolongation.

It would have been well for England had Suffolk's mission ended here. At this time Henry of Windsor was twenty-three years of age. His disposition was the very opposite to that of his warlike sire. He had been placed when six years of age under the tutelage of the earl of Warwick, a man of all others well fitted to train him in all knightly qualities. Warwick's appointment as tutor to the king was made under the authority of the council, and he was directed to instruct him in all things worthy to be known, and to mature him in the love and fear of his Creator and in hatred of all vice. Warwick appears to have been a diligent tutor; but it may be doubted whether his system of education was the best fitted for his pupil's sensitive temperament. It was one of the strictest discipline, even after he had been crowned king in 1429. No one was to speak to him unless it was in the presence of himself and the four knights appointed to be about his person; and if he needed the rod, he had the authority of the council to chastise him "for his defaults." According to an entry in the Rolls of Parliament, Warwick applied for this authority as his protection against the young king's displeasure and indignation, "as he had grown in years and in stature of his person, and in conceit and knowledge of his high authority." But if Henry ever had a conceit of his "high authority," it would seem that Warwick had whipped it out of him, for when he had grown to maturity he was better fitted for the cloisters than for the throne. He might be ruled, but he had no capacity for governing. He was a mere puppet of sovereignty. There was nothing of the Plantagenet about him. His understanding was weak, his temper effeminate, his capacity of the feeblest description. But he had grown to man's estate, and it was natural to think of providing him with a queen. Gloucester's choice had been set aside by intrigue. Each party was desirous of having him receive a wife from their hands, as it was probable that this circumstance would for ever decide the victory between them. Whether Suffolk had any authority for negotiating a marriage, may be doubtful; but if not, presuming upon the protection of Cardinal Beaufort, he did do so, and was unfortunately too successful. It is said, indeed, that the council had fixed their eyes upon Margaret of Anjou, cousin of the French queen, and the devoted friend of Charles, in whose court she had spent much of her time. She was the daughter of Regnier, titular king of Sicily, Naples, and Jerusalem, and duke of Anjou; but who with all these high sounding titles was the poorest prince in Christendom. The princess herself was accomplished both in body and mind, and was noted for ability and decision of character. Such was the wife which Suffolk or the council chose for the weak-minded Henry, king of England. Gloucester opposed the fatal union, and the sense of the nation went with him; but it was supported by Cardinal Beaufort and other members of the government, and the treaty of marriage negotiated by Suffolk was ratified. But the hand of Margaret was obtained at a great cost. No dowry could have been expected from her poverty-stricken father. Instead of asking as usual in such cases for a dower either in territory or money, by a secret article Suffolk agreed to resign Anjou and Maine, which were wholly or in great part in possession of the English, to her father, whereby the keys of Normandy were put into the hands of the king of France—a cession which excited general public dissatisfaction.

On his return to England the title of marquis was conferred on Suffolk for his services; and in order to

strengthen their party, he and the cardinal persuaded the king, who was wholly under their direction, to confer additional honours on some of the most powerful of the nobility. Thus Holland, earl of Huntingdon, was created duke of Exeter; Humphrey, earl of Stafford, duke of Buckingham; and Henry de Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, duke of Warwick and king of the Isle of Wight. Suffolk's description of Henry's future queen had charmed the weak-minded monarch. Her high birth, great beauty, and admirable accomplishments, were more valuable, he said, than all the gold and silver in the world. Moreover, he represented that by her near relation to the king, queen, and prime minister of France, Margaret would soon procure an honourable peace between the two kingdoms. Henry longed to see this paragon of beauty and perfection. Suffolk was sent with a splendid train of lords and ladies to fetch his bride, and the winds were too favourable for his voyage. Margaret reached England, and was married to Henry in April 1445, and on the 30th of May was crowned with great pomp at Westminster.

By this marriage the feeblest of monarchs was placed under the complete control of one of the ablest, most imperious, and vindictive of her sex. Margaret gained an entire ascendant over her weak husband. The reins of government were resigned into her hands, and she grasped them with eagerness. There was one, however, who shared with her the whole authority of government—Suffolk, who had made her a queen. It was soon bruited abroad that Suffolk, who was constantly with Margaret, looked more like a king than the unfortunate monarch. There was a prejudice against her from the first, and her haughty bearing towards her English subjects soon increased that prejudice. "The good Duke Humphrey," it was said, would have found them a better queen than Margaret of Anjou. Duke Humphrey was at this time the most popular man in England. He had endured cruel wrongs at the hands of his rivals, and had borne them patiently, which increased their esteem and affection. Never, indeed, was the duke of Gloucester more powerful in the kingdom than he was at this time, when he stood almost alone in its councils. The hearts of the people were with him; but this put the seal upon his destruction. It was felt by his rivals that his popularity would prove a formidable obstacle to the authority of Margaret and Suffolk. The vindictive passions of the queen were especially aroused. Duke Humphrey had met her on her road to London after her marriage with five hundred of his followers in livery, in token of his loyalty to the king and his queen; but she had heard of his opposition to her marriage, and had conceived a mortal hatred towards him. Both the queen, the cardinal, and Suffolk, and their party, conceived it necessary to destroy a man whose popularity might become dangerous to their power, and whose resentment they had so much cause to apprehend; but it behoved them to be careful in the matter. Any charge brought publicly against the duke would have raised a commotion in the country, which would have insured their own downfal. But "where there is a will there is a way." The usual place of holding a parliament was at Westminster. One since the marriage of Henry with Margaret of Anjou had been held there, in which an Act made in the reign of Henry V.,—"That no peace should be made by the dauphin of France without the assent of the three estates in parliament"—was repealed. No doubt Gloucester lifted up his voice against this measure, but his voice was now about to be silenced for ever. In February, A.D. 1447, a parliament was called, not at Westminster, because the Londoners were devoted to "the good Duke Humphrey," but at Bury St. Edmund's, in Suffolk, where the favourite was in the midst of his dependents. All the knights were ordered to come armed, and Suffolk collected his dependents in and around the neighbourhood of the town. Gloucester came from his castle of Devizes with a small retinue, dreading no danger. On the contrary, the king was conveyed thither, surrounded by a numerous guard, as if there was danger in store for *him*. It was whispered abroad by the courtiers that the duke had formed a conspiracy to kill King Henry, and to place himself on the throne; and on that charge he was arrested and thrown into prison. The tale is soon told. Gloucester was arrested on the 11th of February, and on the 28th of the same month he was found dead in his bed. It was reported that he had died of apoplexy, but the whole nation came to the conclusion that he had been most foully murdered. True, when his body was shown to the people of Bury St. Edmund's no marks of violence was found upon it; but other murdered princes had been exposed to view in the same manner before, bearing no signs of the murderous hands of their enemies, and the people could not be made to believe that he had died a natural death. Indeed few, from the date of his death to the present time, have ever doubted that he fell a victim to the vengeance of Queen Margaret and his political rivals. Subsequently five of his retainers were seized, and accused of being accomplices in his treasons, and they were condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered; but when they were only half hanged, they were cut down, and just as the executioner was proceeding to quarter them, Suffolk produced the royal pardon, and they were recovered to life. The reason given by Suffolk for this barbarous mercy was, "that the king from his cradle had a singular veneration for the glorious and immaculate Virgin, the mother of God," and that as the Feast of Assumption was near at hand, he pardoned them and others who had conspired to deprive him of his crown and his life. But no proof was ever given of a conspiracy; and all the world believed in their innocence, and in the guilt of those who had condemned them and afterwards procured their pardon.

If any proof was wanting to establish the innocence of "the good Duke Humphrey," it might be found in the after-conduct of Queen Margaret and the marquis of Suffolk. Like Ahab, who, when Jezebel had procured the murder of Naboth, greedily seized his coveted vineyard, they hastened to lay hands on all the estates of the deceased duke, Suffolk having the lion's share, and the rest being distributed among their party. No opposition was made to their plunder; for Gloucester left no legitimate children, and Dame Eleanor could not, on account of her conviction, claim

any property. But retribution speedily followed their crimes. That old rival of Gloucester, the Cardinal Beaufort, did not long survive him. In a few weeks he was stretched on an agonizing death-bed, stung with remorse for his many crimes, especially for the part he had taken in the death of his nephew, and regretting, though he was well stricken in years, that his wealth and his power were fast gliding from him. His chaplain, Baker, represents him as bitterly lamenting that money could not purchase life. "Why should I die," he asked, "having so much riches? If the whole realm would save my life, I am able either by policy to get it, or by riches to buy it. Will not death be hindered? Will money do nothing? When my nephew of Bedford died, I thought myself half up the wheel; but when I saw mine other nephew of Gloucester deceased, then I thought myself able to be equal to kings; and so thought to increase my treasure, in hope to have worn a triple crown. But I see the world faileth me, and so I am deceived. I pray you all to pray for me." Beaufort died in his palace of Walvesy, on the 11th of April, surrounded by the clergy of his diocese, and was buried in Winchester Cathedral. Shakespeare, in his description of his death-bed scene, makes him die without leaving any sign that he thought on, or had a hope for, the bliss of heaven; but this is historically incorrect, for he made this "sign" in the bequests he left for charitable and ecclesiastical purposes, by which he hoped to purchase that bliss. But though he bequeathed the mass of his wealth to charities and the Church, historians agree in representing that it brought no ease in his dying moments to his troubled conscience.

Suffolk was subsequently raised to a dukedom, but he, too, suffered for his crime. He found himself involved in increasing difficulties. It seems probable that the article of the marriage-treaty by which Anjou and Maine were to be ceded to Queen Margaret's father, or rather to the king of France, had hitherto been kept secret; and that if it had been divulged while Gloucester was living, it would have been dangerous to have carried it into execution. And even now there was a difficulty to overcome. At this time Richard, duke of York, and rightful heir to the crown of England, was regent of France, and it was more than suspected he would obstruct the surrender of the provinces. The duke had recently been established in his regency for five years longer, by the consent of the king and his council. But the king and his council were now ciphers in the state. The queen and Suffolk were all powerful. They deprived York of his regency, and bestowed it on Edmund, duke of Somerset, an injury of which it will be seen they soon had reason to repent. But it served their present purpose to make the change. The king of France was impatient for the surrender of the provinces of Anjou and Maine. Their surrender was peremptorily demanded, and the queen and the dukes of Suffolk and Somerset were perfectly willing to give them up; but the English troops which had them in their possession were generally unwilling to surrender them, and some of them refused to do so except by compulsion. Sir Francis Surienne, governor of Mons, was especially refractory. Although he received an order to give up that place, signed by King Henry himself, he refused compliance. Mons was accordingly besieged by a French army, and Surienne made a brave defence; but as the duke of Somerset sent him no relief, he was obliged to capitulate. Not only was Mons surrendered to the French, but all the other fortresses of Maine, which was thus utterly alienated from the crown of England.

The effects of this measure did not stop here. Surienne, at the head of all his garrisons, retired into Normandy. He expected to be taken into pay by the duke of Somerset, but instead of this he met with a cold reception. His troops were in want of sustenance; what was he to do? He was a soldier of fortune, and brave withal: he must do something for his companions in arms. He dared not attack the territories either of the king of France or of England, so he marched into Brittany. Fougères was captured by him, and he repaired the fortifications of Pontorson and St. James de Benoron, and subsisted his troops by the ravages which he exercised on that whole province. The duke of Brittany complained of this outrage to his liege lord, Charles king of France. There can be no doubt but it was an infraction of the truce, for the duke of Brittany, as an ally and vassal of the king of France, was included in its benefits. During the truce the French had plundered many a place in Normandy; but though Charles permitted his own subjects to break it, he was not disposed to permit the English to do so under any circumstances with impunity. He demanded reparation from the duke of Somerset. That nobleman justly replied that the injury was done without his privity, and that he had no authority over Surienne and his companions. But Charles, who was again prepared for war, would admit of no such apology. He insisted that Somerset should recall the plunderers, and make reparation to the duke of Brittany for the damages he had sustained. He was to pay him 1,600,000 crowns, a sum clearly named to render all accommodation impracticable; for setting aside the fact that it was far beyond the damages done by Surienne, it was impossible for the duke to raise such an amount. But Charles was sensible of the superiority which the present state of affairs gave him over England, and he determined to take advantage of it; for while during the truce he had been preparing for war, and consolidating his power, the court of England had been divided into parties more intent upon destroying each other than looking to the interests and welfare of the kingdom. Conquests in France were entirely overlooked, nor was the security even of Normandy provided for. Ill supplied with money, its governor was not only obliged to dismiss some of his troops, but to allow the fortifications of the towns and castles to become ruinous. Moreover, its inhabitants were disaffected towards the English rule, and many of its nobles had concerted measures with their ancient master for expelling the English from their country.

Everything seemed favourable to Charles for breaking the truce, and accordingly, in the summer of A.D. 1449, he invaded Normandy with four powerful armies, one commanded by himself, a second by the duke of Brittany, a third by the duke of Alençon,

and a fourth by the count of Dunois. Towns on every hand, both in Upper and Lower Normandy, opened their gates to his troops. No effective opposition could be made, for the duke of Somerset had no army with which he could take the field, or troops with which he could garrison the towns and castles effectually. With what few troops he had, he retired into Rouen. In all he had only twelve hundred men wherewith to defend the capital of Normandy, a force utterly inadequate to save it, especially as the citizens were as hostile as the French who besieged it. But in the city was the brave Lord Talbot, and where he was, the English were sure to do something to save their honour. Charles besieged Rouen with an army of fifty thousand men, and he had scarcely appeared, before the citizens called aloud for a capitulation. Somerset, indeed, had more to fear from the inhabitants within, than from the French without the walls of Rouen. Some of its citizens pretended to be in the interest of Henry, and obtained permission to guard a part of its walls; but it was only to betray the capital to the French. By their treachery the soldiers of Charles scaled the wall, and established themselves in force between two towers. Discovering their treachery, the brave Talbot charged with a part of the garrison, and slaughtered both French and Normans in great numbers, but his heroism failed to save the city. The whole town rose against the English, opened their gates to the French, and Somerset and his garrison were driven into the citadel. Somerset capitulated on the 4th of November. He purchased a retreat to Harfleur by the payment of 56,000 crowns, and by engaging to surrender several other important fortresses. Talbot was left in the hands of the king of France as an hostage.

On hearing of these events, great indignation was expressed in England against the government. Suffolk was compelled to do something for the honour of the country. But that something was very trifling. In the year 1450 Sir Thomas Kyriel reached Normandy with a force of four thousand men. Kyriel had been a captain under Henry V. and the duke of Bedford, and, though his force was small, he was not afraid of meeting the French, however superior might be their numbers. It was with joy that he found a French army at Fourmigni, and he eagerly engaged them; but while he was engaged, a second army, under the constable of France, fell upon his flank and rear, and, while many of his troops were slain, the rest took refuge in flight. This was the only battle fought by the English for the defence of their dominions in France. The defeat of Kyriel was followed by the surrender of Bayeux, Avranches, and other towns; and Somerset, shut up in Caen without hope of relief, capitulated. Falaise then opened its gates on condition that the brave Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, should be set at liberty; and Cherbourg, after sustaining a siege by sea and land, surrendered on the 12th of August. Thus in one campaign, and almost without a struggle, Normandy was lost to the English crown.

A like rapid success attended the French arms, A.D. 1451, in Guienne. The inhabitants of that province had from long custom become warmly attached to the English government. They looked upon the sovereigns of England as their legitimate rulers. For three centuries they had been governed by them, and they had no inclination to shake off their allegiance. On the contrary, they desired still to live under the rule of England, for they dreaded falling under the dominion of the French. But at this time England had no power to afford them protection. As will be seen presently, it was a scene of the most violent faction and discord, through which its power to protect its foreign dominions was prostrated. King Charles of France was aware of this, and accordingly he sent Dunois into Guienne to annex it to his dominions. It proved an easy task. Left unprotected, in order to preserve their honours and estates, the far greater part of the nobility submitted without resistance; and, for similar reasons, the fortified towns, on the approach of the French, opened their gates. Bordeaux and Bayonne made some resistance, but no relief appearing, they, too, submitted. In a brief space of time the whole province, which had been united to England from the accession of Henry II., was swallowed up in the French monarchy. Of all the conquests of the English in France which had cost so much blood and treasures, Calais only, with a strip of marshy land commanded by its batteries, remained in their possession; while nothing remained of the hereditary dominions of their kings. It is said that the French themselves were surprised at the rapidity of their conquests; but the secret of their success lay in events now about to be narrated: for as the conquests of Henry V. in France were chiefly owing to the violent factions which then prevailed, so the loss of those conquests, and other dominions, was also chiefly owing to the no less violent factions which at this time prevailed in England.

During the two years in which Charles, king of France, was annexing Normandy and Guienne to his dominions, stirring scenes were being enacted in England. And first a terrible vengeance had fallen on the head of the duke of Suffolk. The people had never forgiven him for the part he had taken in the destruction of "the good duke Humphrey." Their bitterest curses rested on his head for that crime; and as the misfortunes of the country became under his and Margaret's rule from time to time more and more humiliating to the nation, their curses became louder and deeper. The loss of Rouen, in 1449, finally sealed his doom. The rage of the people against him, and the queen, also, knew no bounds. And that rage was shared in by both houses of parliament. A spirited minority had for some time made bitter complaints; but when Normandy was lost, the minority became a majority, whose indignation was overwhelming. It is possible he might have escaped his fate some time longer, if he had not himself thrown down the gauntlet to the nation. Aware of his unpopularity, in a parliament held in January, 1450, he requested the lords "to admit his supplication and desire that he might make his declaration of the great infamy and defamation which was laid upon him by many of the people of this land." Suffolk's "supplication and desire" was granted, and he defended his loyalty and patriotism with great eloquence, and challenged his accusers to the proof of his "infamy and defamation."

That challenge was readily accepted. Within a few days the commons demanded his committal to the Tower, and when this was refused by the lords, except some specific charge was made against him, they subsequently produced not only one but many charges, the most weighty of which were that he had sold this kingdom to the French; that he had made corrupt grants to enrich his own family; that he had misapplied subsidies for his own advantage; and that he had appointed high officers for lucre. Some of the accusations laid against him were weak and improbable; as, for instance, that he designed the destruction of Henry and his partial mistress, Margaret, in order to place the crown on the head of his own son; and that he had contracted engagements with the French in the view of obtaining their assistance for these ends. It is singular that the murder of the duke of Gloucester, for which he was loudly accused by the people at large, was never alluded to by the commons; but that may have arisen from the fact that there was only presumptive evidence of his guilt, which, though amounting almost to absolute certainty, was not sufficient to convict him of the crime. To the charges of liberating the duke of Orleans and ceding the provinces of Maine and Anjou, as a minister, he was certainly amenable, and these were added. Suffolk was committed to the Tower; and on the 13th of March he was brought to the bar of the lords to answer for the crimes laid against him. Falling on his knees before the king, he protested his utter innocence of treason. He confessed that he had been a party to the cession of Maine and Anjou, but he urged truly that he was not the only one concerned in the matter; that it had been authorized by the other lords of the council, and afterwards sanctioned by the peers in parliament. He implicated, with great justice, the peers in other matters laid to his charge; but no answer was made by him to the charges of traitorous intercourse with France, of enriching his family by corruption, and of the misapplication of subsidies to his own advantage. As far as the court and the peers were concerned, Suffolk might have been liberated, but the commons were determined that he should not escape. All supplies were refused until he was punished. He was remanded to the Tower, and, on the 17th of March, when he was again called before the king and the lords at Westminster, after denying the truth of the charges against him, without claiming the privilege of a peer, he knelt down and submitted himself to the king's rule and governance, to do with him according to his pleasure. This was evidently a concerted scheme, for by so doing he avoided the impeachment of the commons, and the result was, that he was sentenced to be banished the kingdom for five years.

The people, however, were not disposed to let him thus escape. Earlier in the year, Moleyne, bishop of Chichester, who had been associated in the government with Suffolk, and Ayscough, bishop of Salisbury, another of his agents, had been murdered by the populace, and they thirsted for his blood likewise. The Londoners rose to seize him, but he escaped their vengeance, and fled to his estates in Suffolk. He hoped to reach the Continent in safety; but his enemies were on the alert. He remained in Suffolk among his relatives, friends, and dependents—before whom he swore on the host that he was a wronged man—till the end of April, and then sailed from Ipswich for Calais. Two small vessels carried the exile and his retinue, and with their sails full spread they made for Calais; but on the 2nd of May, as they were sailing along, they were brought to by a ship-of-war called the "Nicholas of the Tower." Suffolk was summoned on board the Nicholas, the captain of which saluted him, as he stepped on deck, with the ominous words "Welcome, traitor!" The peers had let him escape their tribunal, but he was now brought before one that would show him no mercy. He was arraigned in the ship before a self-constituted tribunal, upon the impeachments of the commons, and found guilty. He was brought back to Dover, and he was "drawn out of the great ship into the boat, and there was an axe, and a stock, and one of the lewdest of the ship bade him lay down his head and he should be fairly dealt with, and die on a sword; and took a rusty sword and smote off his head within half a dozen strokes, and took away his gown of russet, and his doublet of velvet mailed, and laid his body on the sands." There was evidently some powerful organization of the people at this period in England: but who were the directors of the assassination of Suffolk was never proved. It is said that the "Nicholas of the Tower" belonged to the duke of Exeter; and as there were other ships sent to intercept the duke, it seems clear that persons of rank and authority shared in the crime committed by the captain and crew of the Nicholas. But whoever were connected with this tragedy, the people rejoiced at it, and were resolved that others still living should share a similar fate.

Before the fall of Suffolk there had been insurrections in several parts of the kingdom, and especially in Kent. Several had been executed at Canterbury in February; but the spirit of disaffection still existed. It was increased by the conduct of Queen Margaret. Enraged at the death of her favourite, she breathed nothing but revenge, especially against the people of Kent, whom she, it is said, held guilty, and probably not without reason, of his assassination. This gave rise to a popular commotion more formidable than any of those which had been suppressed. It was headed by one John Cade, a native of Ireland. Taking advantage of the temper of the people of Kent towards the government, Cade formed a project from which he hoped to rise to greatness. He assumed the name of Mortimer, that, according to an old chronicle, "he might have the more favour of the people." Some historians have affirmed that he was encouraged in his rebellion by the duke of York, who was then in Ireland, in order to try by that experiment the dispositions of the people towards his family and title to the crown. There is no evidence of this, but the assumption of the name of Mortimer soon brought crowds to his standard. Twenty thousand Kentish men ranged themselves under it. In order to excite their zeal, Cade inveighed bitterly against the numerous abuses of government, and promised his followers a redress of grievances. At the head of the men of Kent, Cade marched towards London, and encamped on Blackheath. The Londoners favoured the manu-

gents. There was a regular correspondence kept up between them and Cade while he lay at Blackheath. While here two addresses were sent to the king and council—one entitled "The Complaint of the Commons of Kent," and the other "The Requests of the Captain of the great Assembly in Kent." These addresses professed great attachment to the person and government of Henry, but requested the redress of certain great and real grievances; the punishment of certain evil counsellors, who had oppressed the people at home, and lost the king's dominions abroad; and that the king would take about his person the true lords of his royal blood—namely, the dukes of York, Exeter, Buckingham, and Norfolk, together with all the well-affected barons of his kingdom. The list of grievances complained of in these addresses, and the members of the council marked out in them for destruction, startled the court. While, therefore, pretending to be preparing answers to them, troops were collected in London to resist the "Commons of Kent" by the sword. Discovering this, Cade and his followers retired to the woody country about Sevenoaks. A detachment of the royal army under Sir Humphrey Stafford followed them, but he and his brother were both slain, and his troops defeated. Elated by this victory, Cade and his followers returned to Blackheath. It would appear that the soldiers had not fought with a good will at Sevenoaks, and it is certain that the main body of the army expressed a reluctance to fight against their countrymen, who had only called for a reasonable redress of grievances, and who had taken the field for the rights and liberties of the nation. The affair had now, therefore, become serious. Disaffection towards government was rife among all classes. Men of rank and fortune favoured the revolters, and even the vassals of the court lords were unwilling to fight against them. The court was compelled to disband the army and make concessions. Lord Say, one of the most obnoxious ministers, who, in a song composed after the death of Suffolk, had been recommended to sing "Spare me, O Lord, for my days are as nothing," with others who had been closely connected with the duke, were sent to the Tower, which the Lord Scales undertook to defend for the king. Henry himself removed to the Castle of Kenilworth. Cade had still maintained the appearance of moderation, for in a conference with the archbishop of Canterbury and the duke of Buckingham, after his victory at Sevenoaks, he treated them with respect, and promised that when the requisitions in his addresses were granted, they would lay down their arms. These, however, not being granted, on the 1st of July the insurgents advanced towards Southwark. Cade demanded an entrance into London, which, after a debate in the common council, was granted. On the 2nd of July the gates of the City were opened to him and his followers. An old chronicle says that he "rode about the City bearing a naked sword in his hand, armed in a pair of brigandines, wearing a pair of gilt spurs, and a gilt sallet (helmet), and a gown of blue velvet, as he had been a lord or a knight;" and Fabyan records that when he came to London Stone he struck it with his sword, and exclaimed, "Now is Mortimer lord of this city!" Cade, however, preserved the strictest discipline on that day, and in the evening he led his host quietly back to the Borough. The same good order was preserved on the following day, when they again entered the City; but having by some means obtained possession of the person of Lord Say, the mayor and judges were compelled to sit at Guildhall and pass judgment upon him: he was beheaded in Cheapside, and his son-in-law Cromer, the sheriff of Kent, soon after shared the same fate. No further mischief was done, and the insurgents again retired in good order to the Borough. But they had evidently cast longing eyes on the wealth they had seen displayed in London, for on the following day, on again returning to the City, they commenced the work of plunder. It is said that Cade himself set the example by robbing the house in which he had dined. These acts disabused the citizens of their belief that grievances were to be redressed by lawless tumults. When the insurgents had again retired for the night, they resolved to defend London Bridge against their further entrance into the City. Aided by the garrison of the Tower, under Lord Scales, they blocked the way against them. There was a fierce fight upon the bridge, which lasted six hours, and which cost many lives, but the insurgents were defeated. Dispirited by their repulse, a short truce was agreed upon, and when a pardon was under the great seal proclaimed in Southwark to all such as should return to their homes, in a few hours the whole force dispersed. It appears, also, that the bishop of Winchester, who proclaimed the pardon, promised a redress of grievances, but which promise was never fulfilled. Nor was the promise of pardon kept, for it was soon after annulled as extorted by violence. A reward of one thousand marks was offered for the apprehension of Cade, or for his head. That reward was eagerly sought after, and one Alexander Iden, an esquire, obtained it. Cade had got secretly to horse, and had galloped across the country towards the Sussex coast, but Iden overtook him, and after a fierce encounter slew him; and his head was afterwards stuck on a pole on London Bridge, with its face turned towards the pleasant hills of Kent. Others, also, were overtaken in their flight, or taken in their own homes, and executed as traitors. This formidable insurrection was quelled; but we turn now to a civil conflict of far greater significance, and which is known in history as "The War of the Roses."

When Richard, duke of York, was recalled from the regency of France in order that he might not stand in the way of Queen Margaret and the duke of Suffolk, he had been sent to quell an insurrection then existing in Ireland. That rebellion had been quelled by him; and, after he had effected peace and quietude, he had gained the hearts of the people of the "Emerald Isle" by his mild and prudent counsels. During the troublous times which England had since then experienced, he had remained contentedly in Ireland; but, notwithstanding, he considered his post there—and it was so considered by his friends—as a kind of exile. He was quietly put out of the way for political purposes. King Henry was an imbecile monarch; the queen and Suffolk wished to govern; and Richard, duke of York, having a title by hereditary right to the crown, might under these circumstances, had he been present in England, have proved a

dangerous rival to them all. But the duke could not always be kept in Ireland. In the summer of this year, 1551, he resigned his command in that country and appeared in England. It is said that attempts were made to prevent his landing, but that he came with such a force that government had no power to prevent it. It is clear, however, that he had no present hostile intentions, for after paying a short visit to the king in London, he retired to his castle of Fotheringay.

Anterior to the duke of York's arrival in England, Somerset, his successor in the regency of France, who had lost everything there except Calais, had returned to his native land. It might have been supposed that he would have been consigned to obscurity; for of all men in the kingdom, after the death of the duke of Suffolk, he was the most unpopular among the people. But instead of sinking into oblivion, he became more exalted than ever. He succeeded to Suffolk's power in the ministry and his credit with Queen Margaret. No one was so great in the state as Somerset. Alarmed at the return of the duke of York, Somerset, as the nearest male relation to King Henry, and the head of the younger branch of the house of Lancaster, was set up as a rival claimant to the succession. Violent quarrels arose between the government and the Yorkists, in which some dark deeds were committed on both sides. At the same time neither party was willing to proceed to extremities. As Hume observes, it was natural to expect that they would have flown to arms, and have decided their quarrel after their usual manner, by war and battle, under the standards of the contending princes; but instead of this a long train of faction, intrigue, and cabal preceded military operations. And there were causes for this suspension of desperate extremities. Hume remarks: "By the gradual progress of arts in England, as well as in other parts of Europe, the people were now become of some importance; laws were beginning to be respected by them; and it was requisite, by various pretences, previously to reconcile their minds to the overthrow of the house of Lancaster, ere their concurrence could reasonably be expected. The duke of York himself, the new claimant, was of a moderate and cautious character, an enemy to violence, and disposed to trust rather to time and policy, than to sanguinary measures, for the success of his pretensions. The very imbecility of Henry itself, tended to keep the factions in suspense, and make them stand long in awe of each other: it rendered the Lancastrian party unable to strike any violent blow against their enemies: it encouraged the Yorkists to hope that after banishing the king's ministers, and getting possession of his person, they might gradually undermine his authority, and be able, without the perilous expedient of a civil war, to change the succession by parliamentary and legal authority."

Soon after the arrival of the duke of York from Ireland, the dispositions which appeared in parliament favoured these expectations of his partisans. In the house of lords the duke of Norfolk boldly accused Somerset of the guilt of bringing about "the over great dishonours and losses that be come to this full noble realm of England." The commons went still further. One member proposed that as Henry had no children, and was not likely to have any, the duke of York should be proclaimed heir to the throne, for which plain speaking he was committed to the Tower. The whole house, however, ventured to present a petition against the duke of Somerset, the duchess of Suffolk, and several other lords and ladies attached to the court, praying the king to remove them for ever from his person and councils. The commons also passed a bill of attainder against the duke of Suffolk, in which bill he was set down not only as the murderer of Gloucester, but also of other princes of the blood. Henry rejected the bill of attainder; but he evaded the prayer of the petition, by saying that he would banish all the lords for one year, except he should have occasion for their service in suppressing any rebellion.

Encouraged by these dispositions of parliament, in Feburary, 1452, the duke of York took up arms. In a proclamation issued at Shrewsbury, in which he stated that as the duke of Somerset had laboured his destruction by envy, malice, and untruth; and that the said duke was all powerful about the king's person, by which means the land was likely to be destroyed, he therefore had fully concluded to proceed in all haste against him with the help of his kinsmen and friends, in such wise "that it shall prove to promote ease, peace, tranquillity, and safeguard" of the kingdom. York declared he had no evil intentions against the king, his only object being to redress grievances, and to bring the authors of them to justice. At the head of ten thousand men he marched towards London. A royal army was sent against him, but he escaped it and appeared before the city gates. Those gates were shut in his face, and York retreated into Kent. It is probable that he expected to be joined by the greater part of those Kentish men who had been engaged in the late rebellion; but few joined him, and when a royal army appeared in his front at Dartford, after a brief parley, Henry, who was with it, agreed to a peaceful negotiation. The king sent two bishops to York's camp as his negotiators; and when they asked why he was in arms, he replied that it was for his own safety, and that as soon as the duke of Somerset was removed from court, and submitted to a trial in parliament, he would disband his army, and attend the king as his most humble and loyal subject. Somerset was ordered into custody, and York having disbanded his army, waited on the king in his tent unarmed. But the order given for the apprehension of Somerset was mere mockery. As York repeated his charge of treason against him, he stepped from behind the curtain and offered to maintain his innocence. A mutual recrimination ensued. York declared that Somerset was a traitor, and Somerset, with equal boldness, affirmed that *he* was the traitor. York was betrayed; as he left the king he was arrested and conducted to London. Had the queen and Somerset had their will, he would probably have been executed: but Stow says it was noised about that Sir Edward, earl of March, son to the said duke of York, was coming towards London with a strong power of Welshmen, "which so feared the queen and council, that the duke was set at full liberty." York took his oath in St. Paul's, on the 10th of March, before king Henry and most of his nobility, that he would be his true and faithful subject, and never take up arms against him,

and he then retired to his castle at Wigmore, on the borders of Wales.

While York lived in this retreat, events occurred which had the twofold effect of increasing the public discontent and of favouring his pretensions. It has been seen that the people of Guienne were attached to the English government, and that they only submitted to the rule of France because that government made no exertions for their protection. About this time commissioners arrived at court from the nobility of Guienne, and the citizens of Bordeaux, representing the earnest desires of the people of the country to return to their allegiance under Henry. If a fleet and an army were sent to assist them they would gladly, it was represented, shake off the French yoke. As the queen and Somerset felt that the loss of that country was attributed to their measures, whereby they had become obnoxious to the people, they eagerly listened to these representations. If Guienne could be recovered they conceived they would regain the favour of the nation. Accordingly a commission was granted to the brave old Talbot to raise a body of troops for the enterprise. Talbot was at this time an octogenarian, but he executed this commission with all the spirit and activity he had displayed in earlier days. Some four thousand good soldiers were collected and equipped, with whom, in the autumn, he landed in the isle of Medoc, near Bordeaux. As he approached that city there was a stormy debate in the municipal council, some being for letting the French garrison leave the city in safety, and others desiring that they should either be thrown into prison and kept as hostages, or given up to the fury of the population. What would have been the result of this debate is not certain, for in the midst of it Talbot marched into the city and made the French garrison prisoners of war. Having secured that important conquest, and received a reinforcement commanded by his son, the lord Lisle, Talbot marched from thence into the Bordelois and Perigord. His march was one of triumph. The nobles crowded to his standard, and the people hailed him as their deliverer. In almost every town in Guienne the standard of the red cross of England soon floated in the breeze. At this time Charles, king of France, was engaged in a war against his son, the dauphin, and the duke of Savoy. He was in the neighbourhood of the Alps when he heard of this revolution in Guienne, and he hastened to quell it. On reaching the province he endeavoured to win over the people by promises of better government; but in vain. They hated the dominion of the French, and turned a deaf ear to the charmer. Thus defied, Charles advanced against the towns on the Dordonne and the Garonne with fire and sword. Some were captured, and a terrible vengeance was inflicted on their inhabitants. In the summer of A.D. 1453, Charles laid siege to Castillon, a place of great strength and importance. He had an army amounting to twenty-two thousand men under his command, but fearing that the English would attempt to raise the siege, he fortified his camp, and had a numerous artillery planted on its ramparts. At the head of a thousand men-at-arms and five thousand archers Talbot and his son, the lord Lisle, marched from Bordeaux to relieve the beleaguered city. At a glance the brave old warrior saw that the odds were against him; but the Talbot of old times never knew fear, and he still remained undaunted. The command for an assault was given, and heroically was it sustained. At one time the French recoiled from the fierce onslaught of the English, who, despite the havoc made in their ranks from the French artillery, broke into the camp; but at length Talbot and his son were slain, and the battle was over. About one thousand of the English were left dead on the field of battle, and the rest took refuge in flight. Castillon was captured, and its fall was followed by that of Bordeaux: Guienne again fell under the dominion of France, and all hopes of recovering it were for ever extinguished.

It was in the month of October that Bordeaux was resurrendered to the French; and in that same month Henry became totally incapacitated for taking any share in the government of which he had long been the nominal head, and queen Margaret was delivered of a son at Westminster. Strange tales got abroad about this child. It was said that he was not the natural son of King Henry, but changed in the cradle. The birth of young Edward was deemed no joyful incident. As it removed all hopes of the peaceable succession of the duke of York, who was otherwise, in right of his father, and by the laws enacted since the accession of the house of Lancaster, next heir to the crown, it had rather a tendency to inflame the quarrel between the two parties. The unhappy monarch was, however, for some time ignorant of all that was going on in the government. He does not appear to have known that he had a son, for in a letter written by some one at court, in January, 1454, to Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, this passage occurs: "As touching tidings, please it you to wit, that at the prince's coming to Windsor, the duke of Buckingham took him in his arms, and presented him to the king in goodly wise beseeching the king to bless him; and the king gave no manner answer. Nathless the duke abode still with the prince by the king; and when he could no manner answer have, the queen came in and took the prince in her arms, and presented him in like form as the duke had done, desiring that he should bless it; but all their labour was in vain, for they departed thence without any answer or countenance, saving only that once he looked on the prince and cast down his eyen again, without any more." Thus left destitute of the support, even of the appearance of royalty, the queen and the council found themselves unable to resist the York party. The duke and some of the most powerful of his supporters, among whom were Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury, and his son, the Earl of Warwick—two of the most potent and popular noblemen in the kingdom—came to London. Fearing their power, and in the hope of allaying the ferment in the nation, these noblemen were admitted into the council, in which they soon became predominant. Somerset was sent to the Tower, and Richard, duke of York, was appointed to hold a parliament. To that parliament, which was held on the 14th of January, the nobles came in overwhelming array, the partisans of Somerset and York being armed as though they were about to join issue in battle. The proceedings, however, were conducted in

a peaceful and constitutional spirit. An accusation against the duke of Somerset was, it is true, presented to the peers, but it was not prosecuted. Cardinal Kempe, chancellor and archbishop of Canterbury, the great supporter, with Somerset, of the Lancastrian party, came to this parliament. He came attended by servants armed with "bows and arrows, sword and buckler;" but he had scarcely arrived in London when he died. At his death a deputation was sent from the house of lords to the king at Windsor, to consult him concerning the persons who were to succeed him in the chancellorship and the primacy. This was in March; and on their return the deputation reported that at three several interviews they "could get no answer or sign" in reply to their prayer. Satisfied of the king's incapacity for government, therefore, parliament appointed Richard, duke of York, protector of the kingdom during the king's pleasure, or till the infant prince, Edward, came to years of discretion. At the same time, the earl of Salisbury was made chancellor, and subsequently the duke of Somerset was deprived of the government of Calais, which was granted to the duke of York for seven years, with full power to appoint all his officers.

In accepting the protectorship, York desired it might be put on record that the authority was conferred on him from the free motion of parliament, without any application on his part. He also made it a condition of acceptance, that the other lords who were appointed to be of his council should accept and exercise the trust. He further demanded that all the powers of his office should be specified and defined by act of parliament. All this displayed a wise moderation. He seems, indeed, to have exercised the powers of his protectorship in the same spirit. But his moderation was attended with consequences of which he little dreamt. He had no idea of danger of losing his power. Somerset was in the Tower, and Queen Margaret remained quiet in her palace. During the year 1454 there was no sign of opposition to York's authority. But his fancied security was not lasting. On Christmas-day it was reported that the king began to amend; and that on that day the queen took the infant prince to him and told him his name was Edward, on which he "held up his hands and thanked God thereof." Early in the year 1455, Henry had still further recovered; and at the instigation of the queen he resumed the regal authority, his first acts being to annul the protectorate of York and to release Somerset from the Tower.

The hostility between the two great dukes now became fiercer than ever. An attempt was made to compromise it by arbitration; but it was too deadly to be settled by the formal award of arbitrators. It was increased by the removal of York from the government of Calais. That government had been granted to him under the privy seal; and enraged at this injury, he retired into Wales to raise an army. In May, he marched towards London. With him were the duke of Norfolk, the earls of Salisbury and Warwick, the lord Cobham, and other nobles of his party. On the 21st of May, a royal army marched from Westminster to meet him before he reached the capital. Henry was with that army, as were also the dukes of Somerset and Buckingham, the earls of Northumberland, Stafford, Dorset, Pembroke, and other nobles of the Lancastrian party. The opposing forces came in sight of each other at St. Albans. Neither of them were very considerable in numbers, the king's followers consisting of about two thousand, and the duke's of about three thousand men. York still observed the professions of loyalty. Henry and his army were within the town of St. Albans, and York sent to demand that Edmund, duke of Somerset, an "enemy to all the realm," should be given up to him. In his message he expressed great loyalty and affection for the king; but his demand was sternly rejected. The king, or some one on his behalf, replied that he would rather perish than give up the duke to his enemies. The town of St. Albans was defended by strong barriers; but on receiving this defiant reply, York commenced the assault. For some time he met with a vigorous resistance, but at length, either by force or treachery, he obtained an entrance. Warwick was the first to enter; and the duke, while he was engaged in St. Peter's Street, where the royal banner was erected, forced the barriers with the main body of his forces. A fierce conflict ensued, in which many were slain. At length the Lancastrian leaders, Somerset, Northumberland, and Clifford fell dead, all smitten by arrows; and the king himself, with the duke of Buckingham, the earl of Dorset, the lord Sudely, and other nobles were wounded by the same fatal weapons. The royalists fled or surrendered, and the Yorkists obtained a complete victory. The number slain does not appear to have been great, for it is said that all those who fell were buried beneath the roof of the noble abbey. The battle of St. Albans, however, was important in the quality of the leaders of the Lancastrian, who perished on that fatal day. It weakened their party. Henry took shelter in the house of a tanner, where York waited upon him, falling upon his knees before him and declaring himself his most loyal subject, ever ready to obey his commands. It is related that he conducted Henry, whose wound was not serious, to the abbey of St. Albans, where they prayed together before the shrine of St. Alban, "England's first martyr;" after which he brought him to London, still showing him the greatest respect and reverence.

This was the first blood spilt in the fatal "War of the Roses,"—a war which lasted thirty years, and which almost entirely annihilated the ancient nobility of England. But affairs did not immediately proceed to extremities. Although Henry was left a helpless prisoner in the hands of his enemies, York did not put forth his hereditary claim to the throne. He still displayed his wonted moderation. Indeed, he does not appear to have considered himself out of danger, for it is recorded that all his men, with those of Warwick and Salisbury, went "with harness and in harness with strange weapons," and also stuffed their "lords' barges full of weapons daily unto Westminster." If the king was powerless, Queen Margaret still lived to support her small power with spirit and vigour. The fall of Somerset did not, therefore, restore confidence. But there was for a time a cessation of arms. The rival peers met in parliament as usual on the 9th of July; and the duke of York contented himself with procuring an act of indemnity for all those who had appeared in arms against the king at St. Albans.

Beyond this nothing was done in this parliament excepting that all present, Yorkists and Lancastrians, renewed their protestations of allegiance to Henry and his son. The session ended with a declaration of the innocence of the late duke of Gloucester, a general pardon and a prorogation to November. Meanwhile, York managed all the affairs of government. Some of his adherents were rewarded with honourable and lucrative offices, and especially the earl of Warwick, who was appointed governor of Calais. Parliament reassembled on the 12th of November, the duke of York opening the proceedings by commission, as lieutenant of the king. Henry was again unable to observe even the semblance of royalty; and the commons proposed that if the king hereafter could not attend to the protection of the country, "an able person, should be appointed protector, to whom they might have recourse for redress of injuries." The peers do not appear to have been willing to grant the prayer of the commons, for it was thrice repeated before they gave their consent; and then York was declared protector, and he was to hold his authority this time till discharged of it by the lords in parliament, and not, as before, during the king's pleasure. At the same time it was ordained that the protectorate should cease as soon as the infant prince attained his majority, so that there was no attempt made as yet to set aside the succession of Edward to the throne. The young prince, indeed, as the acknowledged heir to the throne, was vested with the usual dignities of prince of Wales, duke of Cornwall, and earl of Chester; so that although this second protectorate of the duke of York is considered by some historians to possess a revolutionary complexion, it is evident that there was no universal desire for a change of dynasty.

But this second protectorate of York had but a brief existence. It is probable that he imagined his authority would prove permanent, but it was not so. It was even shorter than that which he enjoyed during the king's pleasure. York was hardly a match for the crafty queen. Margaret dreaded to see a prince who had such pretensions to the crown as York had in possession of almost regal power. He was consolidating that power by raising his tried friends to the highest offices in the state. His friend, the earl of Salisbury, was made chancellor, and Warwick, as before seen, held the important command of Calais. But in February there was a partial recovery of the king's health; and when parliament met, on the 25th of that month, he appeared in the house of peers, and demanded back and received all his authority as king. York resigned his power, apparently without a murmur; but he was deeply chagrined at being thus outwitted by a woman. But what most deeply wounded him was, that not only he himself was superseded, but that all the officers he had appointed were as unceremoniously dismissed and replaced by others who were devoted to the queen. Both York and his adherents retired to their estates to prepare for future action. Frequent meetings were held between him and the earls of Warwick and Salisbury in Yorkshire. Aware of these consultations, and dreading their results, Margaret formed a plot for getting these her three most formidable enemies into her power. As London was not the proper place for executing her design, under pretence of benefiting the king's health she took Henry to Coventry. York and Warwick and Salisbury were summoned thither by the king to attend a council on affairs of moment, and the summons was obeyed; but before they entered the city they were apprized of danger, and fled for their lives; York to his castle of Wigmore, Salisbury to his castle of Middleham, in Yorkshire, and Warwick to Calais. There was now a temporary calm; the court returned to Westminster, and these nobles absented themselves from the king's councils, and maintained an armed neutrality.

At this period, the defence of the kingdom was utterly neglected. The quarrels of the factions left no time to think of its security. In the year 1457, the coasts of the Channel were ravaged by French and Breton cruisers; for as the English had in former times taken advantage of the violent factions in France, so the French now took advantage of the violent factions prevailing in England. There was no imminent danger, but, nevertheless, the court was alarmed. So also were the prelates and great nobles of the land. The English had carried death and destruction into the heart of France; but they had no desire that the French should deal out the same measure of woe on the homes and hearths of England. There was an earnest desire among all parties for a coalition, and Henry is said to have warmly entered into the general feeling. At all events, letters were sent in his name to all the great men of both parties, earnestly entreating them to come to London and be reconciled, that they might unite in the defence of the country. The love of country has ever been strong in the hearts of Englishmen, and all parties responded to the call. The duke of York hastened from the castle of Wigmore, and lodged himself in his fortified mansion of Baynard's Castle, on the banks of the Thames, below St. Paul's: and Warwick came from Calais with a great band of men "arrayed in red jackets with white ragged staves upon them," and took up his residence at the Grey Friars. Henry and Queen Margaret, and a numerous retinue, took up their residence in the palace of the bishop of London. Within Temple Bar there were crowds of nobles and armed retainers, men at arms and bold archers. Had the French appeared, they would have met with a warm reception, as warm as they would in these days of warlike riflemen. But the French did *not* appear, and the nobles did not assemble in London with their forces to meet them; but only to make peace with each other, in order that when they really invaded England they might be able to send them back to France. In this year, therefore, A.D. 1458, a "unity and concord" was accomplished between the two rival parties in the state, but, unfortunately, it was what the city chronicler of that period called "dissimuled." There must indeed have been a vast amount of dissimulation displayed at this notable gathering in London. Peace was upon their lips, but war was in their hearts. There was mutual distrust and hatred, which required the utmost diligence of the city authorities to restrain from breaking out into open violence. My lord mayor rode almost daily among the streets and suburbs of the city, with five thousand citizens "in harness," to see that the king's peace was not broken; and three aldermen with three thousand citizens kept ward and watch during the

silent hours of the night. Notwithstanding, a seeming reconciliation was effected, Henry acting as arbitrator of the two parties. To render it more binding they went in solemn procession to St. Paul's church, the duke of York, like a gallant gentleman, leading the queen by the hand, and the other rivals walking hand-in-hand before the peace-loving monarch. But all was false and hollow.

The duke of York and the earl of Salisbury retired to York; Warwick crossed the Channel to Calais. In the pacification, Warwick had been allowed to retain his command at Calais, and, on his return, he engaged a strong fleet belonging to the Hanse-towns, and captured some of their ships. In this engagement he exhibited more bravery than prudence, for the attack seems to have been made in utter disregard of the law of nations. At all events, as the Hanseatic league complained, Warwick was required to resort to the court at Westminster, to explain the matter. Warwick obeyed the summons; but as he was returning from court on the 9th of September, he was attacked by men "wearing the king's livery," and he fled for his life. It was with difficulty that he made his way to his barge and escaped assassination. It was believed that the queen and the young duke of Somerset were the instigators of this outrage; and there appears to be but little doubt of the fact. It had been ordered by the king, in giving his award at the recent reconciliation, that the duke of York and the earls of Warwick and Salisbury should build a chapel for the good of the souls of the lords they had killed at St. Albans; but the relations of those lords thirsted for vengeance as much as ever, and Margaret partook of their vengeful feelings. But Warwick justly complained of the attack made upon him as a flagrant violation of the late agreement, and hastened into the north to consult with his father, the earl of Salisbury, and the duke of York. After this conference, Warwick returned to Calais, where he engaged some veteran troops who had been engaged in the wars with France, and the Yorkists were no less active in England; for it had been resolved in their conference that they would stand upon their guard, and henceforth put no trust in the most solemn engagements of their enemies. In truth, both parties in every county now made preparations for deciding the contest by deeds of arms.

Having made fruitless applications to court for the punishment of those who had attacked his son, the earl of Salisbury marched with his friends and vassals in the north towards Wales to join the duke of York. In his route he was intercepted by lord Audley, at Blore-heath near Drayton in Shropshire. Audley had, it is said, ten thousand men under his command, whom he had collected in Cheshire and the parts adjacent where the Lancastrian party prevailed; and Salisbury had about half that number. But what ... strength he made up by stratagem, or by sup... generalship. Drawing up his archers on the b... of a deep and rapid rivulet, he ordered them to charge one flight of arrows and then make a sho... disorderly retreat. Deceived by this manœu... Audley passed the rivulet in hot pursuit, but b... half his troops had joined him, Salisbury's archers renewed the contest, and he, with more than thousand of his Lancastrian followers, was slain.

After his victory, Salisbury joined the duke of ... at Ludlow Castle, and thither also came Warwick ...

LUDLOW CASTLE.

his veteran troops from Calais. At this time, was at Worcester with an army of sixty thousan... with which he approached to give battle. Th... of the Yorkists were greatly inferior in numb... they occupied a strong position. Intrenchme... been thrown up and were fortified by cann... bombards. The forces on whom the Yorkist... depended were the veterans from Calais; reinforcement, in the issue, occasioned their r... said that it was known among the duke of ... fidants that, despite his constant professions he intended to seize the crown. At this ti... many repeated provocations, he may have ... resolution; but there appears to be no gro... lieving that he had long contemplated su... tion in the kingdom. Such a step was one for him to undertake, for, although th... hated, the king still lived in the affection... jects. His secret could scarcely have ... so many years, and yet it is said that it divulged. The design, if he had it, w... present prospects. The veterans fro... commanded by Sir Andrew Trollope, w... that York designed making himself kin... of the 13th of October led his tro... standard of Henry. Struck with cons...

fection, the Yorkist leaders fled; the duke of York, ith his second son, the earl of Rutland, through ales, into Ireland; and his eldest son, the earl of arch, with the earls of Warwick and Salisbury, into evonshire, and from thence to Calais. But, although eemingly ruined, their power was not broken. Warwick was popular in Calais, and he soon raised other forces; and the friends of the house of York in England everywhere kept themselves in readiness to rise on the first summons from their leaders.

Parliament met at Coventry on the 20th of Novem-

ST. MARY'S HALL, COVENTRY.

ber, and its proceedings proved fatal to the cause of the king. The duke of York, with his duchess and ons, the earl of Salisbury, and his countess and son, the earl of Warwick, with the lord Clinton, and many thers, were attainted and their estates confiscated. The young duke of Somerset was appointed to the ommand of Calais. At the instigation of the queen, t was resolved to send commissioners into those parts where the Yorkists most abounded, to punish all those who had been concerned in the late insurrections. Alarmed at this, the people sought protection from their leaders. Messengers were sent to Calais earnestly imploring them to come over to protect them from impending ruin. The men of Kent promised that on their landing they would join them to a man. Warwick was then in a position to come to their aid. The duke of Somerset had hastened to Calais to supersede him in its command, but, on appearing before the port, the batteries opened upon him, and he fled to Guisnes. All his mariners with their ships deserted to Warwick, so that the King-maker, as he was now called, had the command of the Channel. Crossing the Channel, he landed at Sandwich, in June 1460. He brought only fifteen hundred men with him, but he soon found himself at the head of a powerful army. The lord Cobham immediately joined him with four thousand well-armed troops; and so general was the rising, that on the 2nd of July he entered London at the head of ten times that number. The men of Kent still called themselves "the king's true liegemen," and still professed only to require a redress of grievances, and the removal of all those from court who told the king "that good is evil, and evil is good." Warwick was accompanied by his father, the earl of Salisbury, and Edward, heir of York; and the citizens of London hailed him as a friend and deliverer. But he did not remain long in the capital. A royal army was marching from Coventry to attack him, and without losing time, at the head of twenty-five thousand of his best troops he continued his march into the midland counties to meet the Lancastrians. He found them in an entrenched camp near Northampton. A battle was fought and the Yorkists obtained a complete victory. Lord Grey de Ruthin, who commanded Henry's van, having deserted to the Yorkists, as Sir Andrew Trollope had to the Lancastrians at Ludlow, there was a general panic among the royal troops, and the battle was soon over. Among the slain were the duke of Buckingham, who commanded the royal army, the earl of Shrewsbury, and the lords Beaumont and Egremont. About three hundred knights and gentlemen on the side of the king perished, for all quarter was refused to the nobles and the leaders. Orders were given to that effect on both sides, whence it arises that in this, as well as in several other encounters, most of those who were slain were men of condition. Henry was taken prisoner in his tent, and the queen and her son, Edward prince of Wales, with a few attendants, escaped into Scotland.

Henry was still treated with tenderness and respect. The victors marched to London in triumph, carrying him with them, and, on their arrival, he was lodged in the bishop's palace. A parliament was summoned in his name to meet at Westminster. It met on the 7th of October. Messengers had been sent to Ireland to inform the duke of York of the success of his friends, and to entreat him to return to England; and two days after the meeting of parliament, he reached London, and rode in great state to Westminster Hall. York entered the house of lords and advanced towards the throne. Standing under the royal canopy, he laid his right hand upon the gold cloth which covered the throne. He expected an invitation to seat himself thereon, but there was a solemn silence throughout the house. It was an exciting moment. He had now made up his mind to claim the throne, and yet he ventured not to ascend its steps. The silence was broken by the archbishop of Canterbury, who asked him if he had yet paid his respects to the king, and if not, whether he would not go to him in the palace? York replied that he knew of none to whom he owed that title, and in the midst of solemn silence took his departure from the house.

Having made this discovery of his design to claim the crown, he no longer hesitated to secure its possession. Parliament had repealed all the acts passed the year before at Coventry, and there had been an entire change in the ministry. The council chosen were devoted to his cause. Their advice was, that he should make a formal claim of the crown in both houses. Accordingly this was done. On the 16th of October he entered Westminster in royal array, and entering into the chamber of peers, "sat down in the throne royal, under the cloth of estate, which is the king's peculiar seat." It was on that day he made a

solemn claim to be king, setting forth his pedigree in support of that claim. As he derived his descent, he said, from Lionel, duke of Clarence, third son of Edward III., and elder brother to John of Gaunt, from whom Henry was descended, therefore he was the rightful king of England. His genealogical title, upon the principle of direct succession, admitted of no dispute. It was investigated by the lords, with whom the decision appears to have rested, but no flaw could be found in it. His claim and pedigree were perfectly clear and well authenticated. But the lords hesitated to dethrone Henry. The interests of many of them were concerned in their decision. Under Henry of Bolingbroke, and his two successors, they had attained to greatness; how, then, could they pronounce them to be usurpers? By so doing they would have forfeited all the estates and grants of the crown which they possessed, and of which the Yorkists had repeatedly threatened to deprive them. But there were other considerations which made the peers hesitate, both Yorkists and Lancastrians, to dethrone Henry. Not one of them could deny that York had again and again sworn fealty to him; and it was felt that the violent disturbance of a dynasty which had existed for sixty years, was a perilous expedient for the restoration of peace. The peers were in a perfect dilemma for some time how they should decide the question at issue. They were compelled to acknowledge that the hereditary law was in favour of York, but they hesitated to declare him king. The cause was debated with great freedom, and without any great display of bitterness, and at length the matter was determined by a compromise; Henry was to continue king during his life, and the duke of York, or his heir, was to succeed to the crown at his death. But contests for a crown are not so easily compromised, and though the arrangement seemed to satisfy both, in reality it did not satisfy either of the parties.

It was now that the nation became more distinctly divided into two parties, that of Lancaster being distinguished by the red rose, and that of York by the white rose. The chief strength of the Lancastrian party lay in the north; that of York in London, the south of England, and the marshes of Wales. Peace being restored by the compromise—or rather a show of peace—Henry, or the duke of York in his name, sent a messenger to the queen in Scotland, requesting her to return to court with her son Edward. But if Henry submitted to this arrangement, Margaret did not. By it her son Edward was disinherited, and it was not likely that she would calmly submit to such a settlement of the long-pending quarrel. Her proud spirit could not brook such a deep humiliation. Margaret had met with a cordial reception in Scotland, its king, James III., being nearly related to the house of Lancaster. Her cause was espoused by many martial adventurers in Scotland, and she was there joined by the dukes of Somerset and Exeter, and other fugitives of the Lancastrian party. With a small army Margaret entered England. But her forces were soon increased. The earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and other barons and knights, with their retainers, flocked to her standard. At the head of an army of twenty thousand men she marched southwards. Confident of success, York left London to stop her way, committing the custody of the king's person, and the guard of the city to the duke of Norfolk and Earl Warwick. His son Edward was sent forward into the marshes of Wales to raise an army, while he himself with his second son, Edmund, earl of Rutland, and the earl of Salisbury, proceeded northward with what troops he could collect at the moment. He marched leisurely in order to give his friends an opportunity of joining him; but when he reached Wakefield he had only five thousand men under his command; whereas, to his surprise, he found that the queen was approaching with an army four times that number. Thus threatened, he retired to his castle of Sandal, where he was besieged. Had he awaited the arrival of succour he might have been secure, but instead of this, contrary to the advice of his two great confidants—the earl of Salisbury and sir David Hale—he resolved to go forth from his castle and give battle. His resolution seems to have arisen from a spirit of chivalry, for a solemn day of combat was appointed by both parties. It was on the 30th of December, on which day he led his little army down the slopes of the hill on which the castle of Sandal was erected, to meet the enemy. Time and opportunity, therefore, had been given by the commanders of Margaret's forces to insure the victory. The duke of Somerset had advanced the earl of Wiltshire with a body of troops on one wing, and the lord Clifford on the other, with orders to lie concealed till the battle commenced, and then to attack the flanks and rear of the enemy. When, therefore, York attacked the main body of the army under Somerset, he became surrounded, and was totally defeated. The duke himself was slain; and when his body was found on the field,



POMFRET CASTLE.

the head was cut off by Margaret's orders, and, with a paper crown upon it, placed on the walls of York. The earl of Salisbury was taken prisoner, and with several knights taken to Pomfret and there beheaded. The young earl of Rutland, York's second son, was captured on Wakefield Bridge, and murdered in cold blood by the lord Clifford, in revenge for the death of his father, who had perished in the battle of St. Albans. Nearly three thousand Yorkists fell in the battle of Wakefield, and there were great rejoicings among the Lancastrians. Few men of note escaped from the bloody field, and those who did were hunted down with unrelenting revenge. Margaret herself was mad for blood, and her fury was too closely imitated by such of the Lancastrians as had lost friends and relations in the war. In the hour of triumph all mercy was forgotten. There was a "deadly bloodsupping, and much rejoicing;" but as the old chronicler Hall observes: "Many laughed then that soon lamented after, as the queen herself and her son, and many were glad then of other men's deaths, not knowing that their own were near at hand."

When Edward, earl of March, now duke of York, heard of his father's death and the destruction of his army, he was at Gloucester. He had raised a body of troops to reinforce the army in the north; and burning with revenge, he marched towards Shrewsbury to meet the queen and her victorious army. Anticipating this movement, Margaret sent a division of her army, under Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, half-brother to the king, to intercept him, while she herself marched with the main body towards London, where the earl of Warwick had been left in the command of the Yorkists. The forces of Edward and Pembroke met on the 2nd of February at Mortimer's Cross, near Hereford. A dreadful conflict ensued, and the duke of York obtained a complete victory. Three thousand eight hundred Lancastrians were left dead upon the field, and Owen Tudor, the second husband of Catherine of France, with eight other men of rank, were taken prisoners, and according to the barbarous practice of both parties, were beheaded at Hereford. Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, and son of Owen, escaped from the field of carnage.

Thus victorious, Edward marched towards London in pursuit of the queen. But before he came up with her forces there had been another decisive battle. In the hopes of getting possession of the capital and of the king's person, before the young duke of York could come to their relief, Margaret had marched in all haste along the northern road for that purpose. She was still on her march when she heard of the defeat of Pembroke, and though dejected by it, she determined to proceed. When she reached St. Albans, however, she found her progress obstructed. The earl of Warwick, with the duke of Norfolk, were there with the king and a numerous army. The terror of the march of her lawless force had roused the spirit of the southern counties, and of the Londoners especially, so that Warwick had no lack of followers. His troops occupied the town of St. Albans; and it was in vain that the queen's forces attempted to force their way through it. A strong body of archers in the market-place stopped their way. Thus checked, they retreated through a lane from whence they gained the open fields. It was in these fields, between St. Albans and Barnet, that the main body of Warwick's troops were posted. A fierce conflict ensued, and for a long time victory remained doubtful; but Lord Lovelace, who commanded the men of Kent, withdrew treacherously from the combat, and Queen Margaret once more obtained a victory. Towards the close of the day Warwick was beaten at all points, and knowing that death would follow his capture, he hastened from the field of battle—the duke of Norfolk following his example. So precipitate was his retreat, that Warwick left King Henry behind him at Barnet. In this battle the Yorkists lost nearly two thousand men, and there was again deeds of vengeance committed on those who were taken prisoners. In these bloody conflicts no mercy was shown by either party. Every battle swelled the amount of individual vengeance, until the War of the Roses took the dark character of a personal feud. The Lord Bonville, to whose care Warwick had committed the person of the king, would have made his escape, but Henry urged him to remain with him, giving his royal word for his safety; and yet he was beheaded, and the brave Sir Thomas Kyriel shared his fate. The queen and her son found the helpless monarch in his tent, and he was thus again freed from the power of the Yorkists. This was on the 17th of February; and five days after, a proclamation was issued in his name, declaring that fear alone had induced him to consent to the late arrangement respecting the succession to the crown, and denouncing Edward, "late earl of March," as a traitor.

Rewards were offered for the apprehension of the so-called traitor; but he was now in a position to offer rewards for the heads of those who denounced him. His victory at Mortimer's Cross had gained him high renown. In his onward march towards London, numbers from every town and village through which he passed joined his standard. At Chipping Norton he was also joined by the earl of Warwick, with those of his troops who had escaped the slaughter at St. Albans. His forces outnumbered those of the queen, and he advanced with confidence to give battle. And the conduct of Margaret and her troops favoured his cause. Her cruelty and their marauding habits had determined the people of the south to expose themselves to any danger rather than submit to her sway. It would appear that the queen and her party had no money, and that the Borderers and men of the north who fought under her standard had received express permission to plunder all the country south of the river Trent as a reward for their services: but whether they had permission or not, they were not slow in the work of plunder. Their road had been marked with desolation. As they advanced southward, they laid hands on whatever they could carry off. Not only were private houses plundered, but churches and monasteries; and they did not scruple at burning some of them to the ground. After the victory at St. Albans, her troops spent several days in plundering the town and adjacent country. The rich abbey was stripped of all its valuables. Margaret could not get her troops to march towards London till they had completed their ravages; and then it was too late for her to hope to obtain possession of the city. The

Londoners were fully armed to resist her lawless force; and Edward, duke of York, was marching with celerity on her rear. Thus threatened, and despairing of obtaining the capital, Margaret relinquished all the advantages of her victory, and retired with her army into the north. Before Edward arrived his enemies were gone, and he marched in triumph to London. He entered the city on the 28th of February amidst the loudest acclamations of the citizens. He rode through its streets like a king and a conqueror. And a king he resolved to be. A stranger to the scruples and indecision of his more amiable father, he came to the resolution of mounting the throne at once. He was favoured in his design by the people. In field and town every one called him king of England and France. The men of Kent, and the people of Essex, and all the counties near to London, "daily repaired to see, aid, and comfort this lusty prince and flower of chivalry, as he in whom the hope of their joy and the trust of their quietness then consisted."

On Sunday, the 2nd of March, there was a grand review of Edward's army in St. John's field. Great numbers of people flocked to witness the sight. Substantial citizens and the lower orders alike were there; for all classes delighted to do honour to Edward. The review was got up by the lord Falconberg, who embraced the opportunity of addressing the people. So also did the bishop of Exeter, brother of the earl of Warwick. These orators eloquently descanted on the unfitness of King Henry for government; on the misfortunes of his reign; and on his violation of the late solemn agreement by attempting to deprive the duke of York of his succession. The tyranny and usurpation of the house of Lancaster were set forth in glowing colours; and, finally, the orators asked two plain questions would they have Henry of Lancaster any longer for their king? A loud and universal "No!" was the reply. Would they have Edward duke of York for their king? "Yes!" shouted the people; and there were long and repeated shouts of "Long live king Edward!"

By his troops, therefore, and the good citizens of London, Edward duke of York was recognized king of England. So far as their voices went, Henry VI. was deposed, and declared an usurper. But something more was needed to establish Edward on the throne. And that something was soon done. The day following the scene in St. John's field, a great council assembled in London, consisting of all the lords spiritual and temporal within the city, together with the chief magistrates and the more influential citizens. It was no parliament, whose authority alone could legally have put down one king and set up another, but a gathering of Edward's own partisans, and hence, whose opinions leaned only to one side of the question on which they were called upon to deliberate; namely, whether he should assume the government. The question therefore was soon decided. It was resolved that Henry, by joining the forces of the queen, had forfeited his right to enjoy the crown during his life; and that therefore it now devolved to Edward duke of York. It was by such means that the popular election was ratified; and on Tuesday, March 4th, the young king, as he was now called, went first in procession to St. Paul's, and heard the choristers sing Te Deum; and then to Westminster Hall; where, being seated on the throne, and having the sceptre in his hand, he received the homage of all present. In the language of the Rolls of Parliament, "he took upon him to use his right and title to the realm of England and lordship; and entered into the exercise of the royal estate, dignity, pre-eminence, and power of the same crown, and to the reign and governance of the said realm of England; and the same day summoned Henry the sixth, son to Henry, late earl of Derby, son to John of Gaunt, from the occupation, usurpation, intrusion, reign and governance of the said realm."

In this manner ended the dynasty of Bolingbroke, and the reign of his grandson, Henry VI. That the monarch so unceremoniously deposed was an usurper is not historically correct. As Hallam observes, "with us who are to weigh these ancient factions in the balance of wisdom and justice, there should be no hesitation in deciding that the House of Lancaster were lawful sovereigns of England." Henry's own defence, when in the Tower he was accused of the crime of usurpation, whether made by himself or put into his month by his counsellors, was to the point:—"My father," said he, "and grandfather were kings of England. I was enthroned when I was an infant—crowned when I was a child—received the voluntary homage of all my subjects—and enjoyed the royal authority, unchallenged, almost forty years." It was not the defect in his title which cost him his crown, but his incapacity for government. He was weak in body as well as in mind. It has been observed that his glove and boot—still preserved—show that at a period when bodily strength was prized and needful for a ruler, Henry would excite contempt from the want of corporeal as well as of mental powers. He bore no resemblance to his handsome, robust, and active father, Henry V., for his personal appearance was mean, and his countenance melancholy and unmeaning. But his most fatal defects were the weakness of his mental powers, and the placidity of his temper; the one rendering him unfit to rule a kingdom, and the other making him a passive instrument in the hands of those by whom he was surrounded. He had no will of his own. As Hume observes, "He was utterly incapable of exercising his authority, and provided he met with good usage, he was equally easy as he was equally enslaved in the hands of his enemies and of his friends." Perhaps a more sincere Christian did not then exist. Describing his character, a monk, personally acquainted with him, writes thus:—"He was a man of pure simplicity of mind without the least deceit or falsehood. He was very devout and fond of religion; he disliked the sports and business of the world, thinking them frivolous; he loved to read the Scriptures and the old Chronicles; his demeanour at church was peculiarly reverential: he was very liberal to the poor, and his kindness of heart was great. He was in the habit of sending epistles of advice to his clergy, full of moral exhortations, to the amazement of many. A bishop who had been his confessor for ten years, declared that he heard nothing wrong confessed, only venial faults." But such virtues were no qualifications for governing a turbulent people. They were adapted for the cloisters, but not for the throne. It required a strong mind and

powerful will to restrain the power of his nobles, and lacking these, Henry, more than by any defect in his title, lost his crown. But his insignificancy saved his life; for when he fell into the hands of his successor, he was permitted to live; his existence not being deemed dangerous to Edward's sovereignty.

SECTION IV.—House of York.

EDWARD IV.

When Edward IV. ascended the throne he was in the full bloom of youth. He was in the twentieth year of his age only; but though young, he had high capacities for governing. He was brave, active, and prudent. In disposition, he was stern and even cruel. His sanguinary mould of mind was displayed at the very commencement of his reign. A tradesman of London, who kept the sign of the Crown, having facetiously observed that he would make his son heir to the Crown, it was construed as spoken in derision of Edward's assumed title, and the wit was ordered to be forthwith executed. Such an act of tyranny was a proper prelude to the events which mark King Edward's reign.

At his accession there was no time for pageants and festivals of rejoicing. The sword had no time to rest in the scabbard. The queen still had a powerful army in the north, and its dispersion was necessary for Edward's safety. Two days after his solemn recognition before the great altar of the Abbey at Westminster, Warwick therefore marched northward; and the duke of Norfolk was already gone to his county to raise his men. On the 12th of March, Edward himself marched out of London, following the same northward course. It was time that he was up and doing. At this date the queen lay at York, having forces under her command amounting to sixty thousand men. The men of the north had committed terrible havoc upon the south, and fearing that their ravages would be revenged, they flocked to Margaret's standard from all quarters. Letters despatched from York, under the signet of the Lancastrian King Henry, stirred them up to arms; for they announced that the "great traitor, the late earl of March," had "made great assemblies of riotous and mischievously disposed people," and had "proclaimed havoc upon all our true liege people and subjects—their wives, children, and goods." It was to York that both Edward and Warwick directed their course. As they approached, the duke of Somerset, who was commander-in-chief of the Lancastrian forces, marched out of the city to meet them. This was on the 28th of March, on which day the advanced columns of both parties met at Ferrybridge. At first the Yorkists were defeated, but they finally succeeded in passing the river Aire; and on the 29th of March, which was Palm Sunday, the two armies approached each other and formed in order of battle at Towton, about eight miles from York. Both armies were inflamed with the most violent animosity against each other. No prisoners were to be taken, and no quarter given. Such a mighty host of the children of the soil gathered together for mutual destruction was never before or since seen in England. A fierce and bloody battle ensued. It commenced at nine in the morning, in the midst of a heavy fall of snow, and continued till three in the afternoon, with the utmost fury. There was no generalship displayed; both armies moving towards each other in masses, with no other plan than to meet and strike. The Lancastrians were the most numerous, but they were not so well armed as the Yorkists, and the snow driving full in their faces, which blinded them, gave their enemies a great advantage. That advantage was improved by a stratagem of lord Falconberg's. He commanded his archers to advance before the line, and after having sent a volley of what were called "flight arrows" into the midst of the enemy, then to retire. These arrows being light, reached the Lancastrians, who, imagining they were within reach of the Yorkists, discharged their arrows at too great a distance. While they were smitten by the flight arrows of the Yorkists, their quivers became emptied to little purpose. But it was not with the bow that the combat was decided. Pouring in a shower of arrows upon their enemies which did fearful execution, the Yorkists rushed on to a close engagement with the sword, and the spear, and the battle-axe. For hours the two armies were thus engaged in the work of destruction; victory seeming sometimes to incline to the one side and sometimes to the other. At length the Yorkists prevailed. Hard pressed, the Lancastrians broke and fled on all sides. They were pursued with great slaughter. It is said that, between them, the Yorkists and Lancastrians lost above thirty-six thousand men in the battle and pursuit. Many nobles were slain. There in their winding-sheet of snow lay the earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Shrewsbury; and there also lay the lords Clifford, Beaumont, Nevil, Willoughby, Wells, Roos, Scales, Grey, Dacres, and Molineux. There too lay the brave Sir Andrew Trollope, and numerous knights and men-at-arms. The vengeance of Edward was especially directed towards the men of note. Comines says, that the king told him in after-days, that "in all the battles which he had gained, his way was, when the victory was on his side, to mount on horseback and cry out to save the common soldiers, and put the gentry to the sword, by which none or few of them escaped." And those who escaped the sword too often fell beneath the axe of the executioner. After the battle of Towton, the earls of Devonshire and Wiltshire, who were taken prisoners, were beheaded as traitors; and others shared the same fate. The dukes of Somerset and Exeter escaped to York, from whence they fled rapidly to Scotland, taking with them Queen Margaret, her son, and her husband. The victory of the Yorkists was complete.

Edward entered York in triumph. He celebrated the festival of Easter there; after which he marched to Newcastle. Everywhere the people submitted to him; and leaving the earl of Warwick at Newcastle, there to bring that part of the country into subjection, he soon left his army and returned to London. He was impatient to be crowned, and that ceremony was performed at Westminster on the 29th of June, with the usual solemnities. Bourchier, archbishop of Canterbury, performed the ceremony. In order to show that he was a king, he exercised the royal prero-

gative on this occasion of conferring dignities. His brother George was created duke of Clarence, and his brother Richard, duke of Gloucester. After his coronation, he made a progress through the south and west, where the people had been faithful to his interests. Stow says, that he made this progress to understand the condition of the land; but he had other motives in view, for his course was marked by executions. Thus at Bristol, Sir Baldwin Fulford, who was taken "sailing into Brittany to rouse people" against King Edward, was beheaded, as was another, called Haysaünt; the king, in the joy of his heart, laughing and making great game thereat. It was said of him, that he witnessed an execution with as much pleasure as others did a pageant.

Parliament met on the 4th of November. So many nobles had perished either in the battle-field, or on the scaffold, or had gone into exile, that there remained but few to be summoned to this parliament. All those who assembled were devoted to the interests of the new dynasty. They recognized the title of Edward, by hereditary descent through the family of Mortimer; expressed their abhorrence of the usurpation and intrusion of the house of Lancaster, particularly that of the earl of Derby, otherwise called Henry IV.; annulled every grant which had passed in those reigns; reinstated the king in all the possessions which had belonged to the crown at the deposition of Richard II., and reversed all attainders passed in any parliament since that time; especially those of the earl of Cambridge, the king's grandfather, and of the earls of Salisbury and Gloucester, and of Lord Lumley who had been attainted for adhering to Richard II. By subsequent measures, this parliament was actuated by feelings of revenge, or by views of convenience, rather than by maxims of equity and justice. A Bill of Attainder was passed, before which the Lancastrians "fell thick as autumnal leaves." It included Henry VI., Queen Margaret, their infant son Prince Edward, and the dukes of Somerset and Exeter; the earls of Northumberland, Devonshire, Pembroke, and Wilts; the viscount Beaumont; the lords Ross, Nevil, Clifford, Welles, Dacre, Grey, and Hungerford; and numerous other persons of distinction. These dukes, earls, knights, and esquires were attainted for being at the death of the duke of York; for fighting against Edward at Towton-field; for seeking to induce foreign princes to invade the realm; and for more recent movements in arms in Durham and Wales. As for Henry VI., his queen, and their son, they were attainted for the death of Richard, duke of York, and for giving up Berwick to the Scots, soon after the battle of Towton. The estates of all these attainted persons were, by this parliament, vested in the crown, which enabled Edward, at the close of the session, to enrich his friends with the spoils of their enemies. Many of the Lancastrians who were thus stripped of their estates endured much misery in exile. Comines says: "Some were reduced to such extremity of want before the duke of Burgundy received them, that no common beggar could have been in greater;" and that he saw one of them, "who was duke of Exeter, but who concealed his name, following the duke of Burgundy's train, barefoot, begging his bread from door to door." He adds, that Exeter who was next of the house of Lancaster, and who had married King Edward's sister, being "afterwards known, had a small pension allowed him for his subsistence." Nor was it by Bill of Attainder alone that the Lancastrians suffered. In the year 1462, John, earl of Oxford, and his son, Aubrey de Vere, being detected in corresponding with Margaret, were tried by martial law before the constable—condemned, and executed; and Sir William Tyrrel, Sir Thomas Tudenham, and John Montgomery, were convicted in the same court and brought to the block on Tower Hill. By the victory in the field of Towton, the Yorkists had obtained the power, and it was used with the most fearful and unrelenting vengeance.

But the throne of Edward IV. did not yet rest on a solid foundation. Queen Margaret still lived, and she was not a woman to let him reign in peace. While he was labouring to fix himself firmly on his throne, she was with equal ardour labouring to procure forces to pull him down. On arriving in Scotland, the fugitives from York found that kingdom in almost as distracted a condition as that from which they had been driven. Its king, James III., was a boy of eight years of age, and the regents appointed by parliament were divided into parties. The whole country was a scene of factions and family feuds. The royal and noble fugitives, however, were everywhere welcomed. Queen Margaret contracted a friendship with Mary of Guelders, the queen-mother, and proposed a marriage between the prince of Wales and her eldest daughter, which was concluded. She also purchased the friendship of the regents, by surrendering to them the town and castle of Berwick. Gratified by this gift, the Scots laid siege to Carlisle, and assisted her in making an incursion into the county of Durham, but both these incursions were unsuccessful. To counteract her efforts in Scotland, Edward secretly negotiated an alliance with the potent earl of Ross, and gave Warwick a commission to treat with the regents of Scotland for a truce. By these steps a national declaration from Scotland in favour of the royal exiles was prevented; but there were many of all ranks who warmly espoused their cause. Margaret, however, did not despair of obtaining aid from France and the Continent. With the duke of Somerset and a small retinue, she sailed to France, to solicit succours from Louis XI., who had recently mounted the throne. Louis gave her a kind reception; but his sympathy for her distress was not sufficient to induce him to take up the cause of her husband. It was in vain that she solicited aid from that cold and selfish monarch: he was pleased to entertain her, but he would not afford her any succours. Margaret, however, managed to obtain a loan, while on the Continent, of 20,000 livres, and a small body of troops, commanded by Peter de Brezé, seneschal of Normandy, with which she set sail for England. But the winds and the people were against her. She came to Teignmouth, but was prevented from landing; and her fleet being overtaken by a storm, many of her ships were put on shore, near Bamborough castle, and it was with difficulty that the one in which she sailed got safe to Berwick. The few French troops who had engaged in the enterprise took refuge in Holy Island, where they were attacked by a superior force, and most of them slain or captured;

but some of them, with their commander, were enabled to escape and rejoin Margaret at Berwick.

The cause of Henry VI. and his family now seemed desperate. But few of their more powerful friends in England remained to support them. Their ranks had been fearfully thinned by slaughter in the field of battle; by executions on the scaffold, and by banishment from the kingdom. Added to this, Edward, as politic as he was warlike, was negotiating truces with the kings of France and Scotland, the only princes from whom they could expect assistance, and there was every prospect of his succeeding in his negotiations. Such was the situation of Henry VI. in the year 1463. To render it still more desperate, Henry duke of Somerset, the great support of the house of Lancaster, deserted its cause, and made his peace with Edward; receiving as the price of his defection all his forfeited estates. His example was followed by Sir Ralph Percy, and others of the Lancastrian party, and Henry, his queen, and son, now at Edinburgh, were left almost without friends or money; and what was still more bitter, that last remaining comfort in adversity—hope.

It had been better for England had Margaret of Anjou never touched its shores, but one cannot help admiring her indomitable spirit. There is a touch of romance about her career which, marked with treachery and blood as it was, must ever make it interesting in the page of history. Her undaunted spirit could not be subdued by misfortunes. In the spring of this year she sailed from Kircudbright, and landed in Brittany. Obtaining a loan from its duke, she proceeded to France, where she was again treated with hospitality. She stood godmother to the only son of the duke of Orleans, afterwards Louis XII. But while in France, Margaret had the mortification to witness the warm reception given at court to envoys from Edward IV., who were negotiating a truce. It was gall and wormwood to her feelings, for she felt that they were more welcome at the court of France than herself. In truth, Louis XI. wanted to get rid of her, and in order to facilitate her departure, he secretly gave her a small body of troops; first, exacting from her an obligation to deliver up Calais to France if ever it was in her power. But the auxiliaries from France were so few in number that when Margaret arrived in the autumn in Northumberland, the people of that county, though friends at heart, refrained from joining them, and she again retired into Scotland, where she spent the winter.

By these constant exertions of Queen Margaret, the government of Edward was kept in a continual state of alarm. He seems to have been under an apprehension that, however skilful he might be in diplomacy, he should be outwitted by her; and that France and Scotland might yet openly espouse the Lancastrian cause. To guard against these possible dangers, Sir John Nevile, recently created Viscount Montacute, was constituted warden of the marches towards Scotland, with power to array all those in the north who were able to bear arms, to repel invasion, while the earl of Warwick had a fleet placed under his command to guard the sea. It is probable that Warwick's commission was given him for the express purpose of intercepting Margaret on her return from France, but that she, with her auxiliaries, escaped his vigilance. On receiving intelligence that Margaret had landed in the north, Edward marched with an army to York; but finding she had retired into Scotland, he marched back again to the south. While on the Continent, Margaret had been advised by the duke of Burgundy—that same duke who had so long been the ally of the Lancastrians—to wait events with patience; but that virtue was a stranger to her breast. She had, as before seen, obtained some troops from Louis, King of France, and during the winter, while in Scotland, she was busily employed in collecting together those friends of her family who had taken refuge there, and such of the Scots as she could induce, by the promise of rewards, to join her standard. The army she was enabled to gather round her was by no means contemptible; and accordingly, in April A.D. 1464, she was again in the field. Accompanied by her husband and son, she entered England, and for some time her affairs wore a favourable aspect. The castles of Bamborough and Dunstanburgh had been surrendered to Edward by the duke of Somerset and Sir Richard Percy, when they made their peace with him, and that of Alnwick about the same time had capitulated. All these were now either recaptured by Margaret's troops or surrendered to her by their governors. Somerset and Percy, on hearing of her successes, again repaired to her standard, and obtained the command of these castles. Alarmed at these events, Edward once more marched in hot haste to York. But before he arrived there the campaign was over. Lord Montacute, warden of the east marches, had in the battles of Hedgeley Moor and Hexham, which were fought on the 25th of April and the 15th of May, defeated the Lancastrians with great slaughter. In that of Hedgeley Moor, Percy died, fighting "like a man;" in that of Hexham, the treacherous Somerset was taken prisoner, and instantly beheaded. By these victories the fortunes of the house of Lancaster "sank to the lowest points of hopelessness, as if never to rise again."

Queen Margaret and her husband made their escape after the dispersion of her forces by different routes. It appears to be to this date which a romantic story, told by Monstrelet the French historian, of her escape from her pursuers, refers. He says that in a wild forest near the coast, she fell into the hands of robbers who plundered her of her rings and jewels, and treated her with great indignity. There was a quarrel between these robbers about each other's share of the booty, during which Margaret and her son escaped into the depths of the wood. Here they were encountered by a single robber; and Margaret with the decision of her character, threw herself upon his protection; revealing to him her rank, and that of her son. "My friend," she said, "this is the son of your king. I commit him to your care. I am your queen." Struck with the singularity of the event, and the confidence reposed in him, the outlaw conducted the wanderers to a place of safety, supplied their wants, and furthered their escape to the Continent. Margaret took refuge with Philip, duke of Burgundy, who treated her with great kindness, and after making her many presents, sent her to the court of her father, in Lorrain, where she lived several years in privacy and retirement.

Henry, her husband, was not so fortunate in finding the means of escape. Mounted on a swift horse, he was conducted into the county of Lancaster, where he was for some time entertained and concealed by the friends of his family, but his place of retreat was finally betrayed to Edward. Being captured, according to Warkworth, he "was carried to London on horseback, and his legs bound to the stirrups, and so brought to London to the Tower, where he was kept a long time by two squires and two yeomen of the crown, and their men; and every man was suffered to come and speak with him by license of the keepers."

The imprisonment of Henry, the expulsion of Margaret, and the execution and confiscation of all the most eminent Lancastrians seemed to give full security to Edward's throne. The house of York appeared to have planted its power on a sure foundation. Edward's title by blood was fully recognized both by parliament and the people, and was no longer in danger of being impeached by any antagonist. Nor were there any fears from France or Scotland, or from any other foreign power, for treaties and truces were shortly concluded with all from whom he had any cause for fear. With Scotland the truce was to exist for fifteen years, and in its terms it was stipulated that the Lancastrians should neither receive shelter nor aid from the Scots. All his enemies were laid under his feet, and he had made friends with potentates on every hand. Even the Pope was his friend, for on his accession he sent him his warmest congratulations. But peace proved more fatal to the stability of Edward's throne than war. In peace, the energy he had displayed in his warlike operations became wild licentiousness. He delivered himself up without control to those pleasures which his youth, high fortune, and natural temper invited him to enjoy, and the cares of royalty were less attended to than the dissipation of amusement, or the allurements of passion. In the midst of his wild career of pleasure he took a step which in a brief period shook his throne until it fell, and he for a while became an exile.

Jaqueline of Luxembourg, duchess of Bedford, had, after her husband's death, married Sir Richard Woodville, whose seat was at Grafton, in Northamptonshire. Several children were born of this marriage, and among them was Elizabeth, who was remarkable for the grace and beauty of her person as well as for her varied accomplishments. Elizabeth married Sir John Grey, of Groby, by whom she had two sons. But Elizabeth had, through the fatal Wars of the Roses, become a widow. Her husband had been slain fighting under the Lancastrian banner at the second battle of St. Albans. For this offence his estates had been confiscated, and his young widow had become homeless. She went to reside with her father at Grafton, and one day, after a hunting-party, Edward came to the house of Sir Richard Woodville in order to pay his respects to her mother, the duchess of Bedford. As the occasion seemed favourable for obtaining some grace from Edward, the young widow threw herself at the feet of the amorous monarch and implored him to reverse the attainder of Sir John Grey in favour of her innocent and helpless children. Edward was smitten by her beauty, and touched with compassion for her sorrows. He raised her from the ground and assured her of his favour. He became deeply enamoured with the lovely widow Elizabeth Grey; and finding that she would not become his mistress, resolved to make her his wife. They were married secretly "at a town named Grafton, near unto Stony-Stratford, at which marriage was no person present, but the spouse, the spousesse, the duchess of Bedford her mother, the priest, two gentlewomen, and a young man to help the priest sing."

The marriage of King Edward with the widow Grey was one of the most creditable actions recorded in his history. At the same time, it was both rash and impolitic: it was more; for it proved in the highest degree dangerous to his peace and the security of his throne. To secure that throne, as well by the prospect of issue as by foreign alliances, he had determined to make application to some foreign princess. It is said by some historians that he had selected Bona of Savoy, sister of the queen of France, for his partner on the throne; and that Warwick had been sent to negotiate the marriage, which negotiations were brought to a satisfactory conclusion. They say, also, that Warwick, when he heard of the marriage of the king with Elizabeth Grey, immediately returned to England inflamed with rage and indignation, at being sent on what may be called a "fool's errand." But all this is very problematical. That the earl of Warwick was in Paris when Edward, at the Michaelmas of 1464, divulged his hitherto secret union with Elizabeth is not historically true; and it is very improbable that he had been previously employed in actually negotiating a maraiage with Bona of Savoy. Edward made an avowal of his marriage in a great council of prelates and lay lords in the royal abbey of Reading; and the earl of Warwick appears to have been present, for it is said that he and the duke of Clarence took the fair Elizabeth by the hand, and introduced her to the assembly, by which she was acknowledged as their queen. It is certain, also, that he could not have been incensed with Edward at this time, for, in the spring of A.D. 1465, we find him sent at the head of a splendid embassy to negotiate treaties of peace or truces with the earl of Charolois, the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany, and the king of France, who, at that time, showed some compassion for the exiled family; and if Edward had made any advances toward Bona of Savoy, their compassion might be mingled with resentment. Warwick, therefore, was certainly at peace with Edward at that time, and a peacemaker between him and foreign potentates; but soon after, he became his declared and implacable enemy.

Elizabeth was crowned on Sunday, the 25th of May, with great solemnity at Westminster; after which there were for several days feastings, and tournaments, and public rejoicings of unusual magnificence. Up to this period there does not appear to have been any great aversion displayed towards the marriage of the king. Some may have "found fault with him," and "cast out open speeches that the king had not done according to his dignity;" but if the "public rejoicings" mean anything, it would appear that the people were generally satisfied at the choice of a

queen which the king had made. It was his after-policy that produced the animosity which was soon displayed towards him by all classes; and especially among the nobles of the land. It was a period when no man looked upon the rise of another without jealousy; and when, after the coronation, honours and riches were showered upon the one family of which the queen was a member, then it was that the nobility became "truly chafed." As it has been observed, "they looked with the same fear and dislike upon the influence of a queen for the advancement of her friends, as they had done in a former reign, when Margaret was surrounded with obnoxious favourites, and they pulled down Suffolk and Somerset."

From the commencement of Edward's reign, the Nevilles, who had mainly contributed to raise him to the throne, had enjoyed an ascendant influence in the administration of the affairs of government. To their lot had fallen the highest emoluments and honours. While Edward was engaged in his pleasures—too often licentious—they ruled the state. The earl of Warwick himself was virtually the chief minister of the crown and the commander of the forces. He was also chamberlain, governor of Calais, and warden of the marches towards Wales. The income he derived from his offices was princely, and equally princely was that which he possessed from his patrimonial property. His next brother, John, Lord Montacute or Montague, had been created earl of Northumberland, and invested with the confiscated estates of the Percys, as a reward for his victories at Hedgeley Moor and Hexham, over the Lancastrians. His brother George likewise came in for a share of Edward's favours, for he held the chancellorship while bishop of Exeter, and was finally made archbishop of York. But when Elizabeth became queen, there was a change in court favours. By her influence with her husband, which was great, she drew every grace and favour to her own friends and kindred. It was natural that her elevation to the throne should be accompanied by the aggrandizement of her family; but it was so immoderately pursued and rapidly accomplished, that it quickly awakened the jealousy and resentment of all those who had been the chief supporters of the throne. They were entirely supplanted. Elizabeth's relations crowded to the court, eager to obtain lucrative places or form noble alliances, and Edward too readily favoured their suits. Sir Richard Woodville, the queen's father, was created Earl Rivers, and appointed treasurer and lord high constable. Her eldest brother, Anthony, was united to the orphan daughter of Lord Scales, with the title and a vast estate. John, another brother, attracted by wealth, married the dowager-duchess of Norfolk, then eighty years of age. The queen's own son, by her former marriage, was created marquis of Dorset, and betrothed to the heiress of the duke of Exeter; and her five sisters were united to nobles of the highest rank. This rise of the Woodvilles, hitherto of no note, to authority, opulence, and honours, disappointed the hopes of many candidates for royal favour, and weakened the influence which the Nevilles, and other supporters of the crown, had hitherto exercised in affairs of state. Hence it was that Warwick became gradually estranged from the king. His ambitious spirit could not brook the idea of seeing others surpass him in authority and influence. But as yet he only displayed a coldness: he long concealed his altered feelings, and observed the outward appearance of loyalty. Nor as yet did the court display any open hostility towards the great earl; but the queen, by her influence, was secretly undermining his power in the state.

So well did each party dissemble the feelings which they entertained towards each other, that in February, A.D. 1466, the earl of Warwick had the honour of standing godfather to the queen's first child by her marriage with Edward—the Princess Elizabeth. But in the year 1467, the secret jealousy and mutual dislike between the court and the Nevilles became openly manifested. The influence of the queen and the Woodville family brought about this consummation. They looked upon the power which the three brothers of the Neville family still possessed in the affairs of government with jealousy and terror, and desired to diminish it in order to increase their own. Edward entered into their views, and a resolution was formed to reduce that power. The archbishop of York was the first assailed: in June, the king demanded and received the seals from him, and they were given to the bishop of Bath and Wells. At that time there was a parliament sitting at Westminster, and an overt act was passed which aimed another blow at the power, influence, and wealth of the Nevilles. That act empowered the king to resume the estates he had given away, with some exceptions, since his accession to the throne; and he immediately resumed two manors which he had granted to the archbishop of York, for services rendered in raising him to the throne.

While Edward was thus ungenerously attacking the Neville family, the great earl of Warwick was absent on an embassy to the court of France. Edward desired to marry his sister Margaret to Charles, count of Charlerois, and heir to the duke of Burgundy. The count had been the warm friend of Henry V. and the Lancastrians; but on finding that Edward was established on the throne, like many others, he changed sides. His wish was to ally himself with the English monarch by marriage, and by the strictest bonds of friendship. But Warwick was the avowed enemy of Charles, and he insisted that it would be more politic for Margaret to marry a son of Louis XI., king of France. Edward seemed to fall in with his views, and his mission in France was to negotiate the alliance with Margaret and the French prince. Warwick was received at the French court, then at Rouen, with all the honours that could have been paid the greatest monarch. Louis, who was eager to form a union with the king of England, and to defeat the views which his enemy, the count of Charlerois, had in view, met Warwick several leagues from Rouen, and conducted him into the city. The whole city came out to meet him; and priests in their copes, bearing banners and crosses, presented him with holy water. Warwick was nobly entertained by Louis for twelve days, during which period they had many secret audiences. He returned to England on the 5th of July, and he was followed by the archbishop of Narbonne, and the bastard of Bourbon, who came

to complete the alliance which Warwick had negotiated. But they were too late. While Warwick was absent on his mission, the bastard of Burgundy arrived at the court of England. Charles came ostensibly for the purpose of performing a joust with Anthony, Lord Scales, the queen's brother, but in reality to secure the hand of the Princess Margaret. And that was no difficult task. Overlooking the commission he had given to the earl of Warwick, Edward eagerly embraced his proposal. Conceiving that, by such an union, the house of Lancaster would be deprived of its chief support, and a powerful confederate would be secured in prosecuting his claims in France, he gave his hearty consent to it. Commissioners were appointed on both sides to settle the terms of the marriage. In the meantime, an event happened which made the alliance still more desirable, for on the 15th of July, Philip, duke of Burgundy, died, and Charles succeeded to all his vast dominions. In every respect the alliance was more desirable than that of France, and it was certainly more popular among the English. Warwick, however, was deeply mortified. Considering himself insulted and disgraced, he retired in an ill humour to his castle of Middleham in the north. The manner with which his brother had been treated by the king during his absence increased that ill humour; and it was easy to foresee that, sooner or later, there would be an open rupture between Warwick and the court. But for the present, he does not appear to have formed any idea of pulling down Edward and restoring Henry VI. to the throne. The marriage of Margaret with the duke of Burgundy was finally agreed to by Edward in a great council held at Kingston-upon-Thames, on the 1st of October, after which the king, queen, and court made a progress to the north. They spent their Christmas at Coventry, and while there, a seeming reconciliation was effected between the Woodville and the Neville families. The injured archbishop of York, returning good for evil, appears to have been the peacemaker on this occasion, for which Edward, pleased with the event, rewarded him with the restoration of the two manors of which he had been unjustly deprived. Warwick rejoined the court at Coventry, and for some time there appears to have been great concord between them. In May, A.D. 1468, Edward announced to his parliament that he intended to attempt the recovery of the English dominions in France, an announcement that met with the warmest approval of that assembly. To enable him to execute his design, two-tenths and two-fifteenths were unanimously granted. No doubt Warwick attended that parliament, and gave his voice for war, although it is possible he may not have been sincere, as there is every reason to believe that he was still friendly with the French monarch, Louis XI.

The union of Margaret with Charles, duke of Burgundy, was to be celebrated as soon as a dispensation could be obtained from the Pope. That was no easy matter. The French monarch had great influence at the court of Rome; and though he could not prevent the Pope from granting the dispensation, he had the satisfaction of knowing that he retarded the happy event for full six months. At length, however, all the preliminaries of the marriage were finally settled. On the 18th of June, therefore, Margaret set out for Burgundy. At her departure, she rode through the streets of London behind the earl of Warwick! Margaret was married at Dam on the 9th of July; and two days after there was another marriage, out of which arose strange and startling events. That marriage was between George, duke of Clarence, brother to the king, and Isabel, the daughter of the earl of Warwick. Clarence thought himself neglected by the king, and he imputed that neglect to the Woodvilles, against whom he entertained the most violent animosity. Their common hatred of this family led to a close intercourse between Clarence and the earl of Warwick; and this intercourse gradually improved into a union of interests, which was finally cemented by the marriage between Clarence and Isabella. Edward was decidedly opposed to this match; but the wedding took place at Calais, Isabella's uncle, the archbishop of York, performing, and the earl, her father, being present at the ceremony. It was a fatal marriage; for, from the time of its completion, England became the scene of insurrections, deadly enmities, and hollow reconciliations, which ended in as fierce a civil war as ever marked the history of a nation.

Meanwhile, an insurrection of an alarming character broke out in Yorkshire among the farmers and peasants. Fifteen thousand men assembled in arms under a leader called Robin of Riddesdale. At first it was a mere resistance of the agricultural population to a local impost. The officers of the hospital of St. Leonard's at York demanded certain quantities of corn as their right, and the farmers refused to pay. The grant had been made by King Athelstane; and it was said that the revenues at this time were no longer expended for the relief of the poor, but were secreted by the managers, and employed to their private purposes. The insurgents approached the gates of York, and John Neville, earl of Northumberland, armed his retainers, and marched against them. Robin of Riddesdale was captured and beheaded, and many of his followers were slain; but though the insurgents were defeated, they were not dispersed. On the contrary, their numbers soon increased to sixty thousand men; and they found leaders to head them of greater abilities and higher rank than Robin of Riddesdale. Some historians have held that this insurrection was raised by the emissaries of the Neville family; but there does not appear to be any foundation for the assertion. Had this been the case, John Neville, earl of Northumberland, would not have armed his retainers to oppose them. At the same time, the earl of Warwick and his brother George, archbishop of York, were in no haste to afford the king aid against them; for when the insurrection had become formidable, he beseeched them and his brother Clarence to hasten to his assistance, they still lingered in Calais. It is also true that Sir Henry Neville, one of the family, with Sir John Coniers, also a relation, became their leaders, and that the insurrection which, at first, was only designed to resist an impost, grew into one which aimed at the downfal of the Woodvilles. There was a general cry for their removal from the council as the taxers and oppressors of the people. With that cry on their lips, the insurgents

directed their march southward. An army under Lord Herbert, recently created earl of Pembroke, and the Lord Stafford, created earl of Devon, marched against them. But when they arrived at Banbury, the two earls parted company: a quarrel about their lodgings became so violent that the earl of Devon retired with his archers, and left Pembroke alone to encounter the insurgents. The two armies approached each other at Edgecote, near Banbury. Pembroke was at first successful. In a skirmish, Sir Henry Neville was taken prisoner, and was summarily executed. But this execution proved his own ruin. Enraged at the loss of their leader, the insurgents fell upon his forces, consisting chiefly of Welshmen, with such fury that they were utterly routed. Pembroke, with his brother, Sir Richard Herbert, and ten other of the leaders of the royal army were captured, and were beheaded on the field in revenge for the death of Sir Henry Neville. Imputing this disaster to the earl of Devon, who had deserted Pembroke, Edward ordered him to be executed in a like summary manner. Nor did these executions, or rather murders, stop here. The earl of Rivers, the queen's father, and her brother, Sir John Woodville, had escaped from the battle; but they were overtaken in the forest of Dean, and were carried to Northampton, where they perished on the scaffold.

About this time, the duke of Clarence and the earl of Warwick, with his brother, archbishop of York, arrived in England. If they had been implicated in these sanguinary transactions, they must have been adepts in the art of dissimulation. Edward was at Olney, and they joined him there, and offered their services with all the appearance of the most devoted loyalty. Some historians represent that Edward had his suspicions of them, but if so he did not act as if he had. He received them as friends in the hour of need. His condition was most deplorable. His Woodville friends were either dead, or were scattered abroad fleeing for their lives, and the insurgents were almost upon him. But Warwick soon rescued him from all danger he was in from the rebels, for a word from him sent them back with all haste to the north. Grateful for such a service, Edward constituted Warwick chief justiciary of South Wales, and gave him several other offices of power and trust which had been held by his favourite, the late earl of Pembroke. In the interval of peace, indeed, which followed this insurrection, Edward loaded the Neville family with the highest honours and favours. He created Warwick's son George duke of Bedford, and even declared his intention of marrying that young nobleman to his eldest daughter Elizabeth, who, as he had yet no sons, was heir-presumptive to the crown. John Neville, his brother, earl of Northumberland, had the higher title of marquis of Montague conferred upon him. The reconciliation between the court and the Neville family was, early in the year 1470, in appearance so complete that Edward granted a commission to the duke of Clarence and the earl of Warwick to arm all who were able to bear arms in the county of Worcester, and to conduct them to the army the king was then raising to quell an insurrection in Lincolnshire. That commission was given at Waltham Abbey in March, and yet we find that in the previous month, as Edward was being entertained by the archbishop of York, at his manor of the Moor in Hertfordshire, he had such a strong suspicion that he was about to be made a prisoner by his brother the duke of Clarence, and the earl of Warwick, that he got secretly to horse, and, riding all night, reached Windsor Castle. But the duchess of York, the mother of the king and the friend of Warwick, had laboured effectually to dispel his suspicions, and they were, when the insurrection broke out in Lincolnshire, again reconciled.

That insurrection is as unaccountable as the preceding events. No sufficient reason is assigned for it, and, as far as it appears, the Neville family had no hand in exciting and fomenting it. It was headed by Sir Robert Welles, son to the lord of that name. Lord Welles himself was no party to it. On the contrary, he fled into a sanctuary in order to secure his person against the king's anger or suspicions. The army of the rebels amounted to thirty thousand men, and they drove Sir Robert Burge, one of the king's household, out of Lincolnshire, demolished his castle, plundered his estate, and declared for King Henry. Without waiting for the forces, the duke of Clarence and the earl of Warwick were commissioned to collect and arm, Edward marched against them. In his route he had induced Lord Welles to emerge from his place of retreat on a promise of safety; but notwithstanding this assurance, he had caused him to be beheaded. He met the insurgents on the 12th of March, at Erpingham in Rutlandshire, and, after a sanguinary battle, defeated them with great slaughter. Sir Robert Welles and Sir Thomas Launde, with other leaders, were taken prisoners and summarily executed at Stamford. The "Chronicle of Rebellion" states that they confessed that the duke of Clarence and Warwick were the partners and the chief promoters of their treason, and that "their purpose was to destroy the king, and to have made the said duke king." Whether it was so or not, the king seems to have suspected such was the case, for he now openly declared hostilities against them. On their parts, also, the duke and the earl threw off their allegiance to Edward; but whether from any preconcerted plan, or from the attitude he suddenly displayed towards them, is not easy to determine. There is not, indeed, any portion of English history so dark and obscure as that we are now passing over. Notwithstanding that this period was the eve of the restoration of letters, and that the art of printing was known in Europe, the historian has to grope his way through thick darkness, tinted with blood, without any guide on whom he can place implicit trust. It is clear, however, that after Edward's victory at Erpingham, there was avowed enmity and hostilities between him and Clarence and Warwick. At the head of the forces they had raised by virtue of Edward's commission, they marched into Lancashire, spreading broadcast inflammable reports against Edward's government. They hoped that Lord Stanley, who had married Warwick's sister, would join them in their revolt; but finding that he continued loyal, they marched into Yorkshire. If they had time given them, they would quickly have raised a formidable army, for they had many friends in Yorkshire; but Edward was already at York,

using his utmost efforts to defeat their designs. While at York, he issued a severe proclamation against the spreaders of false reports; and also a declaration acquainting his subjects with the treasonable designs of Clarence and Warwick, and that he had summoned them, by a herald, to appear before him on the 28th of March, to answer to these accusations, under the pain of being declared traitors. It would appear that Edward had summoned his brother and Warwick to appear before him, and had offered them conditions of no harsh character, but they chose to be denounced as traitors rather than trust themselves in his hands. With the recent examples of his treachery before them, they were wise in not obeying his summons. There was now no safety for them in England, for it was clear Edward's wrath had gone out against them. Disbanding their forces, therefore, they fled into Devonshire, and with their families, and a considerable number of friends, set sail from Dartmouth for Calais. But Calais was no longer a place of refuge for the great earl of Warwick. As his ships appeared before it, the artillery of Calais was pointed against them: the Gascon knight, whom he had left lieutenant there, and who had been informed of all that had been passing in England, resolving to keep the place for King Edward: a piece of service for which Edward rewarded the faithless Gascon with the government of Calais, and the duke of Burgundy with an annual pension of one thousand crowns.

Warwick sailed for Normandy. He arrived at Harfleur in May. He found the bastard of Bourbon there, who was admiral of France. The illustrious exiles were treated with the most profound respect, and great gallantry was shown to the ladies. Lodgings were prepared by order of the French king, for the ladies and their retinues at Valogne, to which they were honourably escorted. The French court was at Amboise, whither the duke of Clarence, the earl of Warwick, with Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, and John de Vere, earl of Oxford, repaired. The French monarch, who possessed all the wisdom of the serpent without the harmlessness of the dove, gave them a hearty welcome. He was especially glad to see his old friend Warwick again. He dreaded the intimate union of King Edward, with his two most formidable enemies, the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany, and he was delighted to find Warwick had broken with his sovereign. On the other hand, when Charles, duke of Burgundy, heard of the honourable reception given to the fugitives, he became furious. Warwick had seized some Flemish ships lying off Calais, when he was refused admittance into that place, and he had been allowed to sell them in Normandy; and by way of reprisal, Charles seized upon all the French merchants who had gone to Antwerp fair. But the French king cared little for the fury of the young duke of Burgundy. Warwick was with him, and he hoped to make him the instrument of overturning the government of England, and of re-establishing the house of Lancaster; and then he should have no fear of Charles, who wore a blue garter on one of his legs, and the red cross on his mantle, to show how fierce an enemy he was "to his liege lord, the king of France."

Louis XI. was never more happy than when he was engaged in intrigue. That in which he now engaged was one of the most difficult he ever undertook, but it was perfectly to his taste. Never was animosity more fiercely displayed than that which had long existed between the house of Lancaster and the earl of Warwick. His father had been executed by Margaret's orders; he himself had twice reduced Henry to captivity, had banished the queen, had put to death all her most zealous partisans, either in the field of battle, or on the scaffold, and had occasioned numerous ills to that family. In his quarrels with King Edward, he had never once thought of taking up the cause of Henry of Lancaster. If he had set up a rival to Edward, it would have been his son-in-law Clarence, and not Henry. His rancour of heart was still bitter against the Lancastrians, yet his reconciliation with them was the task which Louis XI. imposed upon himself; not for the happiness it would bring him to see them live in peace and harmony, but because such a consummation would very likely lead to the humiliation of his enemies. For Edward, king of England, had, in the preceding year, resolved to join the duke of Burgundy, who was at war with France, and if he could but be toppled from his throne, then France would have less cause, and perhaps none at all, to fear.

Having paved the way for a reconciliation between Warwick and Margaret and her son, in the month of June, there was a meeting between these once deadly enemies in the Château of Amboise. There must have been some embarrassment at first. Margaret could not but remember the bitter sufferings Warwick had caused her and her family and friends for fifteen long years; nor could Warwick forget that Margaret had sought his life, and had sent his father and friends to the block. Both had cursed each other in the bitterness of their souls; but, after a brief interview, they joined in cursing Edward of York. Terms had been settled beforehand, through Louis, the peacemaker; and Warwick had driven a hard bargain; one to which, if there had not been a stern necessity, the proud queen Margaret would never have consented. It was stipulated that Warwick should espouse the cause of Henry, and to endeavour to restore him to the throne; in consideration of which service the earl, conjointly with the duke of Clarence, was to be intrusted with the administration of the government during the minority of young Edward, Henry's son, and Prince Edward was to marry the lady Anne, Warwick's second daughter. This marriage was forthwith celebrated in France, on which Comines remarks:—"An unaccountable match this, to dethrone and imprison the father, and then marry his daughter to the son; but this was King Louis's adroit management."

But in this agreement there were sown the seeds of family discord. The duke of Clarence was ill pleased at the prospect of seeing a Lancastrian monarch again on the throne; nor was his duchess at all gratified with the prospect of seeing a younger sister upon the throne, while she remained a subject. It is true a part of the compact was that the crown, in case of the failure of male issue in the young prince Edward, should descend to the duke of Clarence, to the entire exclusion of Edward IV. and his posterity. But this was a remote contingency; one that could hardly

be expected to satisfy the duke's ambition. He was therefore discontented with the arrangement, and his brother Edward found means to increase that discontent. A female diplomatist was set to work by him, who proved to be as skilful in intrigue as the crafty French monarch. "One day," says Comines, "a lady of quality passed through Calais into France, to join the duchess of Clarence. The secret business to be managed by this lady was to implore the duke of Clarence not to contribute to the subversion of his own family, by going along with those who were endeavouring to restore the house of Lancaster—to remember their old insolences, and the hereditary hatred that was between them, and not to be so infatuated as to imagine that the earl of Warwick, who had married his daughter to the prince of Wales, and sworn allegiance already, would not endeavour to put that prince upon the throne to the exclusion of all the Yorkists. This lady managed the affair with so much cunning and dexterity, that she prevailed with the duke to go over to King Edward's party, the duke desiring first to be in England." Nor was this all the service this lady diplomatist rendered King Edward. While in Calais, she wormed out a significant secret:—that its Gascon governor, who had pointed the artillery against the ships in which Warwick and his friends sailed from England, and who had subsequently taken a solemn oath to be faithful to Edward, against all the world, was notwithstanding warmly attached to the great earl's interests. Democritus is right: "a woman's wit is sharper than a man's."

But the mission of this lady seems to have been the sole precaution taken by Edward at this crisis. After the flight of Clarence and Warwick he had disbanded his army, and abandoned himself to his favourite pastime of hunting and his gallantries. It was in vain that the duke of Burgundy, who knew what was transacting in the court of France, urged him to prepare for coming events: he could not quit his pleasures. It is said that the duke even told Edward at what port Warwick designed landing; and that as the sea was an uncertain element, and the fleet he had collected at Harfleur and the mouth of the Seine might possibly not be able to prevent the expedition, he would do wisely to place his kingdom in a posture of defence. But it was to no purpose. The archbishop of York and the marquis of Montague, Warwick's brothers, were with him, and had sworn to be true to him against all his enemies, and there could be no fear. He wished Warwick would come. He would soon drive him back again; and if the duke of Burgundy could not prevent the expedition, he particularly desired him in his reply to keep a good look out, that when he had beaten him by land he might never again escape to France.

The confidence placed by Edward in the marquis of Montague was a fatal error. At that very time there was a secret correspondence going on between him and his brother Warwick, and he only waited for an opportunity to draw the sword against the king. And that opportunity soon arrived. With ships and troops supplied by the king of France, Warwick set sail for England. He sailed from Havre, and there was no opposition to his course, for Burgundy's fleet had, as he had suggested might be the case, been dispersed by a storm. He landed at Dartmouth on the 13th of September. What were the number of his forces on his landing is not known, but he appears to have been pretty well supplied with troops. His army is said to have been formidable; but if it was not then it soon became so. As Warwick advanced towards London, the whole country flocked to his standard. Edward was then in the north, whither it would appear he had been drawn by a feigned revolt of some members of the Neville family. On hearing of Warwick's invasion, he appointed his forces to meet him at Nottingham. He waited in that neighbourhood some days for his friend, the marquis of Montague, who had promised to bring a powerful reinforcement from York. But he waited in vain: Montague came within ten miles of the royal quarters with a force of six thousand men, and one day as Edward sat at dinner, news was brought him that his troops had tossed their bonnets into the air, and shouted with one voice, "Long live King Harry!" Montague had completed his perfidy. Meanwhile, Warwick, finding that all London was in his favour, and that the capital was safe, changed his route, and crossing the Trent, was marching against Edward with ever-increasing forces. On the other hand, the forces of Edward were fast melting away, like snow before the sun. Those whom he summoned never came, while those who were with him hourly deserted. The van of Warwick's army was within half-a-day's march of his quarters, near the river Welland in Lincolnshire, and he had no troops on whom he could depend. The Lord Hastings was with him with a body of three thousand horse; but he was the brother-in-law of Warwick, and no confidence could be placed in him; and the Lord Scales, now Earl Rivers, was there, but his soldiers had not so great an affection for him as to risk their lives under his command in battle. Even had they been willing to fight, what could they do against the overwhelming numbers every minute approaching nearer and nearer to encounter them? There was no alternative. Edward was resolved to flee rather than fight; and as he was at no great distance from the sea, and three small vessels were then at hand, apparently in the Wash, he, with a few lords and knights and about three hundred men, got on board and put to sea. Where they were going no one knew; and what made their situation more critical, neither Edward nor any who were with him had any money to pay their passage. They shaped their course for Holland; and after narrowly escaping capture from a fleet belonging to the Hanse towns, then at enmity with England, and the merchants of which at all times joined their calling with that of privateers, the ships were ran ashore at Alkmaar, a small town on the coast of Friesland. The revolution was complete; and it was the more remarkable as it was effected without one stroke of the sword or the shedding of one drop of blood.

Finding that Edward had fled, Warwick marched to London. He entered the capital on the fifth of October. The duke of Clarence was with him; for the turn of events rendered it politic on his part still to conceal his altered feelings and hostile projects. It was an age of dissimulation, and he who could not

practise it had no hope of carrying out any designs which he may have formed. It was by this art men ruled and attained to power. Even the common soldiers were taught to practise that art; for Edward, on his departure, exhorted the troops whom he left behind to join the earl of Warwick, and profess great friendship for him, but at the same time secretly to retain their old affection for and allegiance to *him*. But Edward was gone, and Henry was now to re-ascend the throne. One of Warwick's first acts was to release him from the Tower, where five years before he had incarcerated him. He had then walked before him as he carried him to his prison-house, crying, "Behold the traitor!" As he led him from that prison-house to his palace at Westminster, he now exclaimed "Behold your King!" And all this was done, says Comines, "in the presence of the duke of Clarence, who was not at all pleased with the sight."

Henry took up his abode at the palace of Westminster on the sixth of October, and seven days after he went in solemn procession with the crown on his head, attended by his prelates and nobles, to the Cathedral of St. Paul's, to return thanks to God for his restoration. But he was no more king in reality than the meanest of his subjects. Warwick ruled the kingdom, Clarence nominally sharing his power in the Protectorship during the minority of Prince Edward. But this revolution, or "restoration" as it is called in history, was not disgraced with the ferocity which marked the earlier period of the War of the Roses. The earl of Worcester, constable of England, who was for his cruelty styled by the people "the butcher of England," but whom Caxton eulogizes as the "right virtuous earl," was beheaded; but no other death on the scaffold is recorded. Queen Elizabeth, with her mother and three daughters, took shelter in the sanctuary at Westminster, where, on the 4th of November, she was delivered of her eldest son—the unfortunate Edward V. Many of the most noted Yorkists also took shelter in sanctuaries, where the ecclesiastical privileges afforded them protection, while others fled to the continent. What occurred in the parliament which met in November is uncertain, as its acts were erased from the rolls at the time of the counter-revolution, when, as will be seen, Edward regained his throne. From other sources, however, it may be gathered that the attainders of all the Lancastrians were reversed, and that in their turn the Yorkists were attainted; whence their general flight to sanctuaries and to lands beyond the seas. In a brief space of time the country settled down into tranquillity; but it was only like a calm which in the natural world precedes a tempest—deceitful.

When the news of the success of Warwick arrived in France there were great rejoicings. King Louis commanded solemn processions to be made of all the nobles and clergy for three whole days in Paris, and all the great towns of France in honour of God and the Virgin Mary, for having restored Henry of Lancaster to the throne, and for the happy peace his restoration would bring to the two countries. Crafty politician as Louis was, and unprincipled withal, in his way he was a religious sovereign, and it was by these processions that he showed his pious gratitude for the success of his own deep-laid scheme to restore Henry to his throne. But while Louis rejoiced, Charles, duke of Burgundy, when he heard of the revolution was struck with consternation. Comines says he would have been "better pleased if it had been news of Edward's death, for he was in great apprehension of the earl of Warwick, who was his enemy, and now become absolute in England." Charles was already at war with France, and he dreaded the union of the forces of England to those of King Louis, as he could not hope to withstand them. To prevent this if possible he sent Comines to the Gascon governor of Calais, whom he believed to be his friend, and to whom he was paying an annual pension for pointing his artillery against the ships of Warwick on the flight of that earl from England; but when Comines arrived at Calais, he found the treacherous Gascon and his garrison wearing the ensign of Warwick, and declaring as loudly for King Henry as before they had declared for King Edward. By the interposition of the English merchants of the Staple, whose chief trade was with the great manufacturing towns in Flanders, an immediate rupture was prevented; but still Charles was in a dilemma as to the manner in which he was to behave to the exiled monarch. To abandon him in his distress would be dishonourable; to assist him openly, dangerous. Only one course was left to him, to afford Edward aid secretly.

On arriving at Alkmaar, on the coast of Friesland, Edward had found a friend in the Lord de la Grutuse, the governor or stadtholder of Holland, Friesland, and Zealand. He had fled so ill-provided that he "was forced to give the master of the ship for his passage a gown lined with martins," and to content him with promises of future rewards whenever he had an opportunity; and those who were with him were no better off than himself. "So poor a company was never seen before." Grutuse, however, dealt very honourably with them. He gave them clothes, and bore all their expenses till they came to the Hague, whither he conducted them in safety. It was while at the Hague that Charles, duke of Burgundy, secretly assisted his needy brother-in-law Edward. While he issued a proclamation forbidding any of his subjects to join his cause, he sent him fifty thousand florins, and not only furnished him with three or four great ships of his own, but hired fourteen easterling ships all well armed to take him back to England. With about twelve hundred men Edward set sail on the 11th of March, A.D. 1471, from Vere, a free port in Zealand, and five days after he landed at Ravenspur. At his landing he met with a cold reception. The country people, indeed, under one Westerdale, a priest, at first opposed his march, and it was only when he solemnly declared that he had relinquished all thoughts of claiming the crown, and that he had but one object in view, namely, the recovery of his honour and estate as duke of York, that they would allow him to proceed. The citizens of York also showed the same hostility to Edward as the country people, for they would not let him enter the city till he had taken an oath before the mayor and aldermen that he had no intention of claiming the crown. All he desired was the inheritance of his father, the dukedom of York. Edward entered York on the 17th

of March, and having refreshed his "wearied and hungered men," the next morning he marched forward. Pomfret Castle, belonging to the marquis of Montague, the brother of Warwick, was passed without molestation; and so were the towns of Wakefield, Doncaster, Nottingham, and Leicester. On the 29th of March Edward came before Coventry, where he rested, having received some accession of force on his march. At Nottingham, indeed, his forces had become so numerous that he threw off the mask; for, in direct violation of the solemn oath he had taken a few days before, he once more assumed the name of king.

It would appear that Warwick was not ignorant of the designs of Edward. Late in the preceding year a commission had been given in Henry's name to the marquis of Montague to arm all the men in the five northern counties to repel any invasion in those parts, and when Edward passed Pomfret Castle the marquis was there with a powerful army: an army vastly superior in numbers to the forces which Edward himself had under his command. A commission had also been granted for the rest of the kingdom to the duke of Clarence, the earl of Warwick, the earl of Oxford, and Sir John Scroop. In January of this year further steps had been taken to repel any invasion of the coasts of England. Warwick had been appointed admiral of England, and with Clarence and the earl of Pembroke, had a commission to array the men in Wales. What progress had been made by these commissioners when Edward landed is unknown; but when he arrived at Coventry he found himself in the presence of a Lancastrian army, under the earls of Warwick and Oxford. They had expected the duke of Clarence and his army; but it is evident that he purposely kept aloof from them till his brother Edward had approached their quarters. On his arrival near Coventry, Edward offered the earls battle, which they declined: when the duke came they would accept his offer, but not before. But now was the moment for Clarence to complete his secret compact. He was at hand, and when he came putting the White Rose of York over their gorgets, his troops to a man went over to his brother Edward. The two brothers met between their two hosts, and there was "right kind and loving language betwixt them two, with perfect accord knit together for ever hereafter."

As Warwick declined battle, Edward threw himself between the Lancastrians and the capital. He found the gates shut against him, but he had a powerful party in the city, and they soon procured his admission. Indeed, the Londoners quickly forgot the lavish entertainments which Warwick had provided for them ever since he returned from the continent; for Stowe says, "that every tavern was full of his meat; for he who had any acquaintance in that house, he should have had as much boiled and roast beef as he might carry on a long dagger." It would appear, indeed, that Edward when he had once entered the city gates met with a most enthusiastic reception, for which Comines gives these three reasons: the great number of his partisans in sanctuary within the walls, and the recent birth of a young prince; the great debts which he owed to many of the merchant citizens, who could only hope for payment through his restoration; and that the ladies of quality and rich citizens' wives, who while he was on the throne he had pleased with his gallantries, compelled their husbands and relations to range themselves on his side. Even the archbishop of York, to whom his brother Warwick had committed the care of the city and of King Henry's person, once more joined the cause of Henry; for with the consent of that prelate he was admitted by a postern into the bishop's palace, where he found his half-imbecile rival, whom he immediately sent to the Tower.

Meanwhile Warwick had been joined by his brother, the marquis of Montague, and thus reinforced, he marched towards London. He was at St. Albans when he received the intelligence that the Yorkists had possession of the capital, and that the Londoners had received him with joy. He advanced to Barnet on the day before Easter Sunday, and his hope was that he might be able to surprise Edward in London whilst he was occupied in the solemnities of the great festival of the Church. On the same day, however, Edward marched from London. It was late in the day when the two armies approached each other, and the battle was delayed till the morrow. They encamped so near each other that neither of them enjoyed much repose during the night. It would appear, indeed, that Warwick, whose force was encamped upon the high ground half a mile beyond Barnet, and had ordnance to defend his front; "shot guns almost all the night," but that they always "overshot the king's host;" that host being encamped on lower ground, and nearer than Warwick's gunners imagined. The dawn of Easter day revealed their close proximity. In numbers the two armies were nearly equal, and in all there were about forty thousand men prepared to draw the sword and bend the bow against each other. It is said that Clarence had offered his mediation between his father-in-law and brother Edward, but that Warwick sternly refused his offer. "Tell your master," said the proud earl to his messenger, "that Warwick, true to his oath, is a better man than false perjured Clarence, and will settle this quarrel by the sword to which he has appealed." There was but little light on Barnet Heath on that Easter morning when the battle commenced, for the sun had not risen, and there was a great mist; a mist, however, which probably saved Edward from defeat. For three long hours the contending hosts fought in the mist, madly, blindly, and with the utmost fury. Victory alternated. At one time Edward was in the utmost danger. Unconscious that his left wing under Hastings was beaten, he was rushing into the centre of the Lancastrians, and narrowly escaped death. At length Warwick's troops were thrown into disorder. That disorder appears to have been occasioned by the mist which Friar Bungy, a magician, had, it was believed, raised for the occasion. The device on the coats of the troops of the earl of Oxford was a star with rays both before and behind. The brave earl had beaten the right wing of the Yorkists under Richard, duke of Gloucester, and was returning from the pursuit to assist his friends, when his troops were received with a terrible discharge of arrows from the earl of Warwick's men. they taking them to be a body of the enemy whose device was a sun with rays. Apprehensive of trea-

chery, Oxford, with eight hundred of his followers fled, and all became confusion. It was in vain that Warwick endeavoured to retrieve the disaster. In order to revive the courage of his troops, he rushed into the thickest of the enemy, where he met with his death; and his brother, the marquis of Montague, in an attempt to rescue him, shared his fate. Of all the great Lancastrian lords who fought on that day not one escaped, except the earl of Oxford, who joined Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, then in arms in Wales for King Henry. On his side, also, Edward lost several valiant knights and nobles, as Lords Cromwell and Say, and Sir John Lisle, Thomas Par, and John Milwater, who were esquires to the duke of Clarence. The numbers slain amounted to several thousands: the common dead being buried about half a mile from Barnet, where a chapel was erected for the good of their souls. Edward's victory was complete; and no sooner was it gained, than he marched back to London and rode straight to St. Paul's. That night all London was uproarious with joy. The steeples sent forth their merry peals, and the people shouted at the top of their voices, "Long live King Edward!" The poor dethroned Henry had been led out to Barnet, and while the air was rent with shouts for his rival, he was conducted back to the Tower.

Margaret and her son, Prince Edward, had been detained on the continent during the winter. But she was not idle during that season. She had gathered a large army of foreigners and exiles, and with these, on the 4th of March, she finally embarked. Contrary winds had kept her in the Channel for three weeks; but at length on the very day that Warwick had fallen at Barnet, she landed at Weymouth. The news reached her on Easter Monday, and Hall says that, "like a woman all dismayed for fear she fell to the ground." It may readily be imagined that the catastrophe was a crushing blow to her hopes. But she did not wholly yield to despair. For a time her fortitude forsook her, and she meditated escaping with her son and friends to her former place of refuge, France. It had been better for her had she carried that design into execution. But one can conceive how reluctant she might be to take such a step. Her husband was a captive in the Tower, and however insignificant he was both as a man and a monarch, Margaret, though proud and imperious, was not wanting in her duty to him. She longed to release the poor captive from his prison-house. Then again there was her only son by her side, whom she had been taught to believe, and whom she verily believed, was the rightful heir to the crown of England, and she was keenly desirous of seeing that crown adorn his brow. With these feelings mingled those of fell revenge. The hated Edward, duke of York, who had usurped her husband's throne, had driven her into exile, and had slain her friends and supporters—in a word, had ruined her family—was still king of England, and if she could again uncrown him how happy she would be. When, therefore, friends again began to assemble around her, her spirits and hopes revived, and she resolved to stay and make one more attempt to recover the crown for her husband and posterity.

Among those who joined Queen Margaret were the duke of Somerset, the earls of Oxford and Devonshire, the Lords Wenlock and Beaufort, and others of less note. Margaret earnestly desired to send away the young prince, but her supporters would not agree to it. They conceived that young Edward's name would be a tower of strength to their party, and it really does appear to have availed them much. The queen and her son were conducted to Bath, while her friends went their several ways to collect forces. The men of Devonshire and Cornwall especially took up the cause of the House of Lancaster, and in about ten days an army, it is said of forty thousand men, assembled at Bath to fight for the Red Rose of England. It was proposed to march into Wales with this army to join the earl of Pembroke, and from thence into Cheshire, to strengthen it with a body of the famous archers of that county. Had this march been taken, and carried out without opposition, Margaret's army would have been far more formidable than that which Edward had encountered and defeated on the bloody field of Barnet. But he was too keenly alive to the danger with which he was once more threatened, to allow his enemies time to collect in full strength. Having supplied the place of his killed and wounded, he assembled his forces at Windsor, where he kept the feast of St. George, on the 23rd of April. On the following day he marched to seek his enemies in the west. He found them, on the 3rd of May, encamped on the banks of the Severn, near Tewkesbury. They had taken up a strong position in a close at the town's end, having the town and the abbey at their backs,

FONT, ABBEY CHURCH, TEWKESBURY.

and "afore them, and upon every hand of them, foul lanes and deep dykes, and many hedges and hills and valleys,—a right evil place to approach." Edward lodged himself with his host for the night within three miles of them, and on the 4th of May the rival hosts once more joined in mortal combat. For some time the Lancastrians, strong in their positions, repulsed the Yorkists with great bravery. Had they remained in those positions, it would have been difficult to have dislodged them; but Somerset rashly led his men into the open fields by bypaths, and fiercely attacked Edward's flank. Lord Wenlock was to have

ASSASSINATION OF HENRY VI.

supported him, but failing to appear, Somerset was driven back to his entrenchments with great slaughter. Edward and his brother Richard pursued their advantage with their usual impetuosity. At the head of their troops they rushed into the camp of the retreating Lancastrians, and all became confusion and dismay. The unfortunate remnant of the adherents of the Red Rose took to flight. Some fled into lanes and dykes, where they hoped to escape; others were drowned in a mill stream in a meadow close by the town, while others got into the town and took refuge in the church, and the abbey and elsewhere, as they best might. Lord Wenlock was slain by Somerset's own hand as he returned to the camp in a frenzy of despair; and the earl of Devonshire and Lord Beaufort, with many knights and esquires, and about three thousand common soldiers of the queen's army, perished. The queen herself, with her son and the duke of Somerset, and the Lord St. John and other Lancastrian leaders, were taken prisoners. Young Edward, "called Prince," was taken in the field fleeing to the townwards, and was barbarously murdered. Being brought to the king he was asked by the enraged monarch what brought him to England? "My father's crown and mine own inheritance," was the bold reply. He was immediately struck on the mouth by the king's own gauntleted hand, and this brutal act was the signal for his murder, which was performed by the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester.

It is at this time that the duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III., appears conspicuously in the page of history. He had been with his brother when an exile at the Hague, and had returned with him to fight for his kingdom. That kingdom was now won, and Edward and his brothers might well have spared the life of the youthful son of Henry of Lancaster. Gloucester's part in the bloody deed foreshadowed his subsequent character. At this time he was not twenty years of age, and for one so young to display such ferocity, was an evil promise for the future. Whatever gallantry he might have displayed in the battle of Tewkesbury as a knight, it was sadly marred by his cruelty as an assassin. But Richard's nature had none of the milk of human kindness in it. It is, perhaps, from the deformity of his mind that he is popularly supposed to have been deformed in body. Indeed, one of his enemies of the period has depicted him as "little of stature, ill-featured of limbs, crook-backed, having his left shoulder much higher than his right, and hard-favoured of visage." Stow, the antiquary, however, says that he had spoken with some ancient man who was personally acquainted with him, and who affirmed "that he was of bodily shape, comely enough, but of low stature."

The victory of Tewkesbury was followed by executions. The duke of Somerset and other Lancastrian leaders were brought before the duke of Gloucester, constable of England, and the duke of Norfolk, marshal of England, as their judges, and condemned to death; and these judicial slaughters were rendered the more atrocious from the fact that many who were thus judged to death were dragged from the sanctuary of the abbey of Tewkesbury, notwithstanding Edward had promised that those who had taken refuge there should be pardoned. Queen Margaret was enabled to escape from the field; but she was discovered in a small religious house at Coventry, and was carried to London in the train of the victor, and committed to the Tower.

Edward arrived in London on the 21st of May, and on that same night Henry VI. died in the Tower. What death he died must ever remain a mystery. Warkworth's Chronicle relates:—"The same night that King Edward came to London, King Henry, being inward in prison in the Tower of London, was put to death the 21st day of May, on a Tuesday night between eleven and twelve of the clock, being then at the Tower, the duke of Gloucester, brother to King Edward, and many others. And on the morrow he was chested and brought to St. Paul's, and his face was open that every one might see him; and in his lying he bled on the pavement there." On the other hand, Yorkist writers relate that when Henry heard of the fatal reverses of his friends and the death of his son, the effect was fatal to his life. All that is certain, however, is that Henry's death was sudden, and though he laboured under an ill state of health, this circumstance joined to the general manners of the age, gave a natural ground of suspicion that he was most foully murdered: a suspicion which was rather increased than diminished by the exposure of his body to the public view. And as the duke of Gloucester had openly aided in the assassination of his son, and was in the Tower on the night when Henry died, it was natural that he should be suspected of killing him, especially as in after days he was guilty of many a bloody deed. But it may be that Richard was innocent of the crime laid against him: that the unfortunate monarch died broken-hearted.

All the hopes of the House of Lancaster seemed now to be utterly extinguished. Every legitimate prince of that house was dead, and almost every great leader of the party had perished with their swords in their hands, or by the headsman. On hearing of the defeat of the queen's forces at Tewkesbury, the earl of Pembroke, who was levying forces in Wales, disbanded his army, and fled into Brittany with the young duke of Richmond. The earl of Oxford escaped into France. While Edward was in the west, Falconbridge, who had kept the Channel as admiral, by Warwick's appointment, had levied some forces in Kent, and had advanced to London, proclaiming that he was come to deliver King Henry; but the citizens shut their gates against him; and when he attacked the city, both by a land force and with ships on the river, he was repulsed. Falconbridge retired to Sandwich, which he fortified, and on the day after his return to London, Edward marched against the daring adventurer, as "a man of much audacity, and factious withal, whom evil life stirred up to disturb the commonwealth." He was taken prisoner and immediately executed. From that time there was no opposition to Edward's government from the adherents of the House of Lancaster. Peace was restored to the nation, and on the 6th of October a parliament was summoned, which ratified as usual all the acts of the victor, and recognized his legal authority. Among those acts may be named the creation of his infant son, Edward, Prince of Wales. In July he summoned a great

council of prelates, peers, and knights at Westminster, all of whom took a solemn oath to maintain the succession of the young prince to the crown of England: Richard, duke of Gloucester, who subsequently supplanted the young prince, and was probably his murderer, being the second temporal peer who took that oath. As a natural consequence of his complete success, Edward heaped honours and rewards on those who had fought for him, while many of those who had fought against him were sought out and put to death. Some, however, who had been hostile to the Yorkists, submitted to the "favourite of fortune," and were pardoned. The hostile prelates were especially taken into Edward's favour; a policy which gained for him the future support of the clergy. Fuller says that many persons in playing their cards, and who scarcely knew which was the trump, easily obtained their pardons; the course being that some friend of the successful party should procure the seal of the king, and that the chancellor should confirm "the bill."

Having crushed all his enemies, the court of Edward once more became the gayest and most magnificent in Europe. As before, also, he devoted himself to pleasure and amusement. By his gaieties and easy familiar manners, he regained that popularity which, by the repeated cruelties exercised upon his enemies, he had well-nigh forfeited. The example of his jovial festivities tended to the same end; for it served to abate the former acrimony of faction among his subjects, and to restore the social disposition which had been so long interrupted between the opposite parties. Every one seemed to be satisfied with his government, and the memory of past calamities served only to impress the people more strongly with a sense of their allegiance, and with the resolution of never again incurring the hazard of renewing such direful scenes. The storm of passion which had so long disturbed the bonds of society was, indeed, succeeded by a calm of several years' duration, and which was scarcely disturbed by a feeble attempt of the earl of Oxford to interrupt the harmony. That nobleman, subsequent to his escape to France, with a few ships for some time kept the coast of the Channel in a state of alarm, and finally captured Mount St. Michael, in Cornwall, but he surrendered upon condition that his life should be spared; and he was sent prisoner to the castle of Ham, near Calais, where he remained for twelve years. Edward had pardoned George Neville, archbishop of York, but he was now accused of having corresponded with the earl of Oxford, stripped of his effects and revenues, and imprisoned in the castle of Guisnes.

But prosperous as he was, Edward was not without his disquietudes. His public triumphs had done little to secure the brotherly union of the members of the house of York. The great earl of Warwick had two daughters: one married to the duke of Clarence, and the other contracted to the son of Henry and Margaret, who perished at Tewkesbury. After the death of the young prince, Gloucester, whose hand had assisted in his death, became a suitor for his affianced bride. Warwick had left enormous possessions, to which his daughters were coheiresses. Clarence, however, had no desire that the great wealth of the Nevilles and the Beauchamps should be divided. He concealed Anne, the younger sister, from the pursuit of Gloucester. But Gloucester was not to be thwarted. For several months he sought after his lady-love, and, according to the gossip of the day, he discovered her in the guise of a cook-maid, and placed her in the sanctuary of St. Martins, till he could plead his cause before the king. Both dukes were present on the occasion, and there was a fierce quarrel between them. My lord of Clarence had no objection to my lord of Gloucester having his sister-in-law Anne for his wife, but he would not willingly "part livelihood." At length, however, a seeming reconciliation took place, and the question of "livelihood" was finally settled by a parliament A.D. 1474, dividing the great fortune of Warwick between the royal brothers: Clarence retaining the greatest part of the disputed accession. But long before this division took place, Richard appears to have married the lady Anne, for their son and only child was born at Middleham Castle, which had been the property of the earl of Warwick, A.D. 1473. The greatest sufferer in this adjustment was the widowed countess of Warwick, mother of both Isabella, the wife of Clarence, and Anne, the wife of Gloucester. Although she had brought the mass of the property into the family, she was left almost destitute.

Three years of repose in England passed away. During that period Edward was employed in securing allies and amassing treasures. He had settled disputes which had existed between him and the Hanse towns; had confirmed the long truce with Scotland; had renewed alliances with the kings of Portugal and Denmark; and had contracted an alliance offensive and defensive with the dukes of Brittany and Burgundy. His parliament was all complacency. Large supplies were granted for the replenishment of his once exhausted treasury. Money also was obtained from the free gifts of the people. "Every one," says an old monkish writer, "gave the king what he pleased:" adding, that by such benevolences or free gifts, "greater sums of money were collected than had ever been seen before or will *ever be seen hereafter*." Much of this money was spent in the king's pleasures; but it would appear that in collecting it he had the ends of ambition in view. War with France was ever popular in England, and he was now meditating a new conquest of the provinces which had been lost on the continent during his predecessor's minority. Circumstances seemed to favour his purpose. The dukes of Burgundy and Brittany were urging on the revival of the ancient claims to the French crown; and the constable of France and many of its great nobles were secretly disaffected towards the French government. Hence Edward resolved to recover the lost provinces on the continent. He conceived, also, that it was a favourable opportunity of taking revenge on Louis for the support he had given to the House of Lancaster; a support which he still feared might one day be renewed, for the young earl of Richmond was still at liberty, and there were many whose eyes were fixed on him as their future king.

Great preparations were made for an expedition into France, and these being at length completed, in the summer of 1475 Edward embarked at Sandwich

He landed at Calais. He had with him one of the finest armies that had ever crossed the channel from our island. It consisted of fifteen hundred men at arms, fifteen thousand archers, and a great number of foot soldiers and artillery. Comines says that the embarking and landing occupied three weeks. Before his arrival at Calais, Edward sent a herald to the French king demanding the surrender of not only the lost provinces, but his kingdom, which he claimed on the old ground as his right and inheritance. Comines says, that this letter was written in such an elegant style that he could scarcely believe any Englishman wrote it. But the purity of the language, and the arrogance of this celebrated epistle, had no weight with the French monarch. Instead of returning an answer, he took the herald into his closet, chatted with him most familiarly, telling him that he had a high respect for the king of England, whom he knew had been induced to undertake the expedition by the duke of Burgundy and the disaffected constable of France, who would certainly abandon him as soon as their own purposes were answered. Then in the politest manner possible, Louis tendered the herald three hundred crowns, which he received, and promised him one thousand more if he contributed to bring about a peace. Pleased by the condescension and liberality of the French monarch, the herald, who was a native of Normandy, promised to promote his views to the utmost of his power, and advised him to address all his overtures of peace to the lords Howard and Stanley, who had great influence with Edward, and who were, in point of fact, adverse to the expedition. Louis was much revived by what he got out of this soft-pated herald; and committing him to the care of the celebrated historian Comines, he was sent back to the king who sent him "as well pleased as possible."

As related by Comines, this invasion of France by Edward IV. partakes of a comedy rather than a tragedy. The duke of Burgundy was to join him at Calais with a powerful army; but instead of this he arrived at his camp attended only by a slender retinue. He had ruined his army, he said, by an unsuccessful expedition into Germany. Edward showed signs of wrath, but the duke pacified him. If he would march to St. Quentin, he said, the earl of St. Pol, constable of France, would surrender that town into his hands. Edward, therefore, boldly marched to St. Quentin; but on the arrival of the English at that town to take possession of it the constable fired upon them from the ramparts, and sallying out killed a great number before its walls. Burgundy was still with Edward, and he professed to be astonished at the constable's conduct; but finding that Edward was enraged, and suspecting treachery, he took his departure. Edward was already sick of his expedition. Probably he wanted to get back to his pleasures in England. Before his expedition his voluptuous habits had produced satiety, but he could return to them after these mortifications with renewed zest. It is strange, indeed, that this English king, who was so valiant in battle when contending with the House of Lancaster, should, in this invasion of France, have exhibited all the characteristicts of a rank coward. He never made any attempt at fighting for the crown he had so eloquently and arrogantly demanded; nor did Louis of France make any attempt to drive him out of France by force of arms. He stood in dread of him; but he resorted to a trick rather than fighting. Comines was requested to send for a servant connected with a certain English lord, and when he came it was proposed that he should go disguised as a herald to the English camp. After some demur this servant fell in with the proposal, and having learned his lesson, dressed up with a coat of arms made out of the banner of a trumpet, the mock herald returned to the English camp, where he was well received. He played his part so well that a negotiation was opened through commissioners. There was no great difficulty in coming to terms. The English army lay for nearly two months inactive near Peronne, and the winter was fast approaching, so that a war with France for this year was out of the question: especially as no assistance could be expected from the duke of Burgundy. Besides, through conviction or bribery, the lords of Edward's own council recommended an immediate peace with the French king, and it would not have been wise to have resisted their counsel. Moreover, the French king showed himself to be so loving a friend to the English monarch that it would have been discourteous to have resisted his overtures for peace. On the part of Edward, the lord Howard and three others managed the negotiation, and the money of Louis was circulated so freely among them that the preliminaries were soon settled. The professed object of the expedition was to obtain possession of the French crown, or at least to recover the lost provinces of Normandy and Gascony. But nothing more was heard of these claims. There was to be a truce for seven years on these terms: that the king of France should pay to the king of England 75,000 crowns within fifteen days, and 50,000 a year in London during their joint lives; that the dauphin of France should marry the princess Elizabeth of England; and that as soon as Edward had received the 75,000 crowns he should return to England with his whole army. Edward was also to receive 50,000 crowns as the ransom of Margaret of Anjou, queen-dowager of England, which being paid, she was set at liberty and returned to France. But Louis had others to pay as well as King Edward, for it is on record that he bestowed pensions to the amount of 16,000 crowns on the king's favourites; the lords Howard and Stanley receiving each two thousand of that sum for their services in bringing about a peace. It is wonderful how liberal Louis was on this occasion. The two armies, after the conclusion of the truce, remained some time in the neighbourhood of each other; and the English were not only freely admitted into Amiens, where Louis resided, but all their charges were defrayed; wine and victuals being furnished them at every inn without money and without price. One day, indeed, Louis sent Edward three hundred loads of the best wines of France. There was no end to his liberality, and his confidence in the English was unbounded. At one time it is said that above nine thousand English were in Amiens, many of whom behaved so disorderly that Edward desired Louis to shut the gates against them; but he replied that he would

never agree to exclude the English from the place where he resided. Of course such wonderful good friends, as Louis and Edward had become, could not return to their respective capitals without meeting face to face. Graceful courtesies were accordingly followed by mutual greetings. It was agreed that before Edward returned to England the sovereigns should have a personal interview on a bridge thrown across the Somme at Picquigny, near Amiens. It would appear, however, that Louis had a lurking suspicion that all might not turn out so pleasantly as he could desire, for there was a barricade erected in the midst of the bridge, which is described as being made of strong grating or lattice-work, such as lions' cages are made of; the spaces between the bars being no wider than to admit a man's arm. It was through this grating that Louis, king of France, and Edward, king of England, exchanged their mutual greetings. Louis was attended by about twelve of his chief nobility, among whom were John, duke of Bourbon, and the cardinal, his brother; and Edward was attended by his brother, the duke of Clarence, the earl of Northumberland, the lord Hastings, and other peers of high degree. As the monarchs approached each other they bowed low to the ground, and after embracing through the openings in the grating, there was another low bow; and then the king of France bade Edward, as his cousin, right welcome. There was no man living, he said, he was so ambitious of seeing, and he thanked God the interview was upon so good an occasion. Comines tells us that Edward returned the compliment, and that, too, in very good French. After thus exchanging compliments the two kings proceeded to business. A missal and a crucifix were brought to the grate, and each putting one hand on the book and the other on the crucifix, swore with great solemnity to observe the treaty. Then followed a friendly conversation, in the course of which Louis made some advances, which afterwards cost him some pains to evade. Comines says:—"When the two kings had sworn, Louis, who had always words at command, told Edward in a jocose way, that he should be right glad to see him at Paris; and that if he would come and divert himself with the gay ladies there, he would assign him the cardinal Bourbon for his confessor, who would willingly absolve him if he committed any sin." Edward was delighted with the raillery and promised to go to Paris, but on calm reflection Louis thought he had better keep away. On his return to Amiens he expressed to Comines his uneasiness at the readiness with which Edward had accepted his invitation. His brother of England, he said, was a very fine king and a warm admirer of the ladies, and he might find some dame at Paris so much to his taste as to tempt him to return. It would be better for the sea to roll its waves between them: his predecessors had been too often in France and Normandy already. But as he had invited his guest, how could he refuse to entertain him? That night at supper Lord Howard, who remained at the French court, assured Louis that Edward would make merry with him at Paris, and for a time he evaded the subject; but on its being renewed by the noble lord the "king put him off with the greatest gentleness and wisdom imaginable, pretending that his expedition against the duke of Burgundy would require his immediate presence in another part of France." There was nothing, indeed, that Louis so ardently desired as the departure of Edward and his troops from his dominions; and to expedite this he forthwith paid the money stipulated by the treaty, and Edward having received it embarked with his army at Calais, and on the 28th of September arrived in England.

As Hume remarks, "this treaty did very little honour to either of these monarchs. It discovered the imprudence of Edward, who had taken his measures so ill with his allies as to be obliged, after such an expensive armament, to return without making any acquisitions adequate to it. It showed the want of dignity in Louis, who rather than run the hazard of a battle, agreed to subject his kingdom to a tribute, and thus acknowledge the superiority of a neighbouring prince possessed of less power and territory than himself. But as Louis made interest the sole test of honour, he thought that all the advantages of the treaty were on his side, and that he had overreached Edward by sending him home on such easy terms. For this reason he was very solicitous to conceal his triumph; and he strictly enjoined his courtiers never to show the English the least sign of mockery or derision. But he did not himself very carefully observe so prudent a rule: he could not forbear one day, in the joy of his heart, throwing out some raillery on the easy simplicity of Edward and his council, when he perceived that he was overheard by a Gascon who had settled in England. He was immediately sensible of his indiscretion, sent a messenger to the gentleman, and offered him such advantages in his own country as engaged him to remain in France."

It is clear that the French considered that their king had by this treaty degraded the English; and although Edward and his corrupt ministers thought different, there were many among his martial followers who were indignant at such a termination of the enterprise, deeming it dishonourable to their country. It is related by Comines, that the duke of Gloucester and other Englishmen of high rank were not present at the interview of Picquigny, as being averse to the treaty; but he adds that they afterwards went into Amiens to King Louis, who generously presented them with plate and some fine horses. But Richard, duke of Gloucester, was no party to the treaty of Picquigny, and by standing aloof from it he raised his own reputation to the disadvantage of the king, his brother: "drawing the eyes of all, especially those of the nobles and soldiers, upon himself." One thing is certain, that by the treaty of Picquigny the chivalrous grandeur of England had come to an end. In his message to the French monarch at the commencement of his expedition, Edward had called upon him either to come forth and fight for his crown or resign it; but the crafty Louis laughed at chivalry as a freak of fools or madmen, and by his success in statecraft he demonstrated to the world that it might be governed without an appeal to the sword.

After his return from France, Edward again indulged in his wonted pleasures. Disgraced as he

was in the eyes of his subjects, and more especially in those of his army, he was as gay as ever. He abandoned himself to sensuality. At the same time he became systematically cruel to his subjects. The slightest appearance of disaffection to his person and government was punished with death. Thus Thomas Burdett, a gentleman of Warwickshire, was executed as a traitor for an angry expression which in these days would only produce a fit of laughter; and one Stacey, a clergyman, was put to death for the imaginary crime of necromancy. In some cases his severity was of a more legitimate character. He plundered his subjects with very little ceremony, but he would not allow them to plunder one another with impunity. And after his return from France the country swarmed with robbers, for his soldiers compensated themselves for the loss of plunder in France by pillaging their own countrymen. To put a stop to these disorders the king went in person with the judges to try the offenders, and every one apprehended for the least theft was hung without mercy. He seems to have delighted in executions. But one intended victim escaped his vengeance. Henry, earl of Richmond, was still alive, and his existence was a perpetual torment to his mind. In the hope of getting him into his hands, an embassy was sent to the duke of Brittany to renew the treaties of alliance, and to prevail upon him to give up the young earl, and his uncle, the earl of Pembroke. His ambassadors were instructed to assure the duke that he would marry the earl of Richmond to one of his own daughters, and thus finally put an end to the quarrel between the Houses of York and Lancaster. Deceived by this fair promise, which was backed by a bribe, the duke *did* give up these earls to the ambassadors; but afterwards doubting the sincerity of Edward, he adroitly recovered them and placed them in a sanctuary, at the same time promising to guard them with so much care that they should not cause any trouble in England. But if the young earl of Richmond escaped King Edward's revenge, not so did his own brother, the duke of Clarence.

In the year 1477 the House of York became suddenly involved in one of the darkest tragedies on record—a tragedy which, in the end, proved fatal to his own family. There had never been any cordial friendship between the duke of Clarence and the queen's relations, and their influence had produced a coolness between the two brothers, which, though slight at first, grew into a most deadly animosity. At this time no one of any note was allowed to die a natural death. One of the commonly reported causes of death was the use of witchcraft; but others who had paid the debt of nature from natural causes were too commonly held to have been poisoned or smothered in their peaceful beds. Isabella, duchess of Clarence, after an illness of a few weeks, died in December, 1476, and one of her female attendants was accused of poisoning her, and without the slightest proof of her guilt was executed. Like his brother Edward, therefore, the duke of Clarence was suspicious and bloodthirsty. But when he thus put the attendant on his duchess in her dying hours to death, he little thought that out of his bereavement his own fate would arise. About the same time Clarence lost his duchess, Charles, duke of Burgundy, perished at the battle of Nanci, leaving an only child, Mary, heiress to all his great estates. Clarence turned his eyes towards this rich succession. He proposed for the hand of this great heiress, and her stepmother, Clarence's own sister, who loved him better than her brothers Edward and Richard, warmly espoused his cause. Edward, however, opposed it with all his might. As soon as he heard of the negotiation his jealousy was aroused, although from motives of policy as well as from natural affection it would have been his wisdom to have promoted the match. It would seem, however, that Queen Elizabeth had something to do in the matter, for her brother, Anthony Woodville, earl of Rivers, was proposed as a proper husband to the wealthy heiress. Earl Rivers was rejected with disdain; but at the same time King Edward caused his brother Clarence's negotiation to miscarry. Clarence had never been very guarded in his expressions about the king, but he now became more bold in his language than ever. But whatever invectives he uttered they were said among his own circle, for he rarely appeared at court or in the council, and when he did appear he was sullen and silent. But the court was well informed of his hard speeches, and soon made him feel its vengeance. It was at this time that Thomas Burdett and the priest Stacey were executed as before related. Both these were in the service of Clarence, and they were clearly put to death not so much for the crimes imputed to them as to wound his feelings. Both died protesting their innocence; and Clarence, who was warmly attached to them, presented himself in the council chamber at Westminster to prove that they had met with an unjust doom. In proclaiming their innocence he bitterly exclaimed against the iniquity of their persecutors. This was Edward's opportunity of wreaking his vengeance on his offending brother. A council of peers and prelates were called, before whom he loaded Clarence with many accusations, and he was committed to the Tower. A parliament was summoned on the 16th of January, A.D. 1478, when the king appeared in person as his prosecutor. He was charged with high treason; but the accusations brought against him were either grossly absurd or of a trivial nature. There was not a single overt act of treason among them. The heaviest articles were that he had caused his servants to report that the king was a necromancer, and that Burdett was unjustly executed. The king therefore held that he was no necromancer, but at the same time he charged Clarence with dealing with the devil by means of conjurors and necromancers. He was also accused of plotting to dethrone the king and disinherit the king's children. He stood charged also with having given his servants large sums of money, wherewith to entertain the king's subjects, to induce them to believe that Burdett had been wrongfully executed. It was said, also, that he had induced some of the king's subjects to take a sacramental oath to be true to him and his heirs; that he had engaged to restore the confiscated estates of the Lancastrians; that he was in possession of an act under the great seal of Henry VI., whereby after the death of Henry's son he was to be heir to the crown; and that his retainers were kept fully armed

to act in his cause at a moment's notice. There was not the slightest foundation for any of these charges; but the king made them, and he had witnesses who swore to them all, and would have sworn to as many more, however baseless they might have been. It was a most unconstitutional trial. The king was the only pleader, and the duke was the only one who dared answer his pleadings. He did answer, and vehemently denied every charge; but it was of no avail. Not a peer spoke in his behalf; and on the 7th of February he was found guilty and received sentence of death. That the peers might not stand alone in the guilt of the blood of Clarence, the commons were prevailed upon to appear at their bar some days after to demand the execution of the sentence. Hitherto everything had been done publicly. He was openly committed to the Tower, openly arraigned before his judges, and openly condemned It was not, however, thought proper to carry out the sentence in an open manner, or even to let it appear that it had been carried out at all. It was afterwards reported that the duke had died in the Tower, but in what manner the people were left to conjecture, for it was kept a profound secret. But the most popular, belief was, that he was caused to be drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine. It is said that Edward, when it was too late, felt all the horrors of a fratricide; and that when any of his nobles pleaded for the pardon of some retainer condemned to suffer for his crimes, he was wont to exclaim, recalling to memory the death of Clarence, "O unhappy brother, no one would speak for you!" The duke of Gloucester was suspected of taking part in this tragedy, on account of their old feud, and because he was friendly with the queen, and profited by his death; and from his former and subsequent deeds it is clear that he would not be nice in such a matter.

Several of the estates of Clarence were granted by Edward to Anthony, earl of Rivers, the queen's brother. As he had done the earl great injuries, Edward hypocritically said this would be an atonement, and would be conducive to the repose of his soul. But it was evident from Edward's after conduct that his own conscience was a torment to him. He had in the course of his ambitious career committed numerous crimes, which neither disturbed his peace of mind nor in the slightest degree excited feelings of regret. To slay his enemies of the House of Lancaster brought pleasure to his cruel mind: to effect the death of a brother was another question—it produced remorse. Yet some historians contend that his outward conduct never betrayed such feelings: founding their supposition on the fact that he continued his round of dissipation and debauchery with greater avidity than ever. But in this very fact we see the remorse he is said to have felt. Every one who commits crime endeavours to drown the voice of conscience in some way or other; some by seeking a justification or palliation, but more by rushing into the vortex of pleasure. Now this latter mode of seeking peace of conscience appears to have been the mode which King Edward adopted. His thoughts are said to have been wholly bent upon his gallantries and voluptuous amusements, thus casting all reflection which would have disturbed his conscience to the winds. He became more and more luxurious and expensive in his habits: the regular payment of the annual pension of 50,000 crowns a year by the king of France, together with the exactions which he still wrung from his people, enabling him to pursue his pleasure at his will. It is said, that in his summer hunting he was wont to have gay silk tents set up for the ladies, wherein he treated them in a most magnificent manner. There were no bounds set to his extravagances; and at this time he seemed not to care what was going on in the political world so long as he could enjoy himself in his lascivious career. This may be illustrated by the fact, that while he was thus indulging his vicious propensities, he permitted the crafty Louis, king of France, to attempt the ruin of the House of Burgundy—which he might have supported by the marriage of his brother, the duke of Clarence, with its wealthy heiress—without let or hindrance.

It has been seen that by the treaty of Picquigny the dauphin of France was to wed Edward's eldest daughter. That union was to take place as soon as she came of age. At that period a princess was marriageable at the age of twelve years: far too young, but still it was the custom. Elizabeth, however, was now in her sixteenth year, and yet no dauphin appeared to claim her hand. Edward had set his heart upon this union, and no one could make him believe that the French king, who so punctually paid his annual pension, would play him false. He flattered himself that Louis would not dare insult him in so tender a point. But the French monarch did dare thus to insult Edward, king of England. He was no longer under a necessity of dissembling, and he now showed himself in his true colours—a false deceitful friend. He had reduced his factious nobles to obedience: he had cut off the head of the duke of Brittany; and his other great rival, the duke of Burgundy, was no longer living to oppose him. His power had revived; and hence when Edward, in the year 1480, sent the lord Howard into France to demand the immediate execution of that article of the treaty, by which it was arranged that the dauphin of France should marry his daughter Elizabeth, Louis refused to comply with that demand, and boldly threatened to withdraw the pension which had been stipulated by the same treaty. Enraged at being thus deceived, Edward renewed his alliance with the House of Burgundy. Mary had married Maximilian, duke of Austria, and Edward engaged to send them a body of six thousand archers to aid them in the war which Louis was still waging with them, if he did not agree to a truce or peace under his mediation. On their part, Maximilian and Mary engaged to pay Edward the fifty thousand crowns a year if he engaged in a war with that crown on their account; and as a further inducement for him to take up arms on their behalf, their son, then an infant in his cradle, was on some future day to marry Alice, daughter of Edward, a child about four years of age. But this treaty of marriage, like Edward's all other contracts of the same kind, came to nothing.

While Edward was thus meditating a war against France, he resolved to prevent all interruption from Scotland. In the spring of A.D. 1480 great prepara-

tions were made for invading that country, both by sea and land. At this time Scotland was in a state bordering upon civil war. James III., who was king of Scotland at this time, was tottering on his throne. His brothers were intriguing against him, and his nobles were disaffected. Richard, duke of Gloucester, was sent to aid these discontented nobles, and to fan the smouldering embers of a civil war into a flame. The duke had a high military reputation, and had the favour of his army; but his operations for two years were of a futile character. There was an alternation of raids on the borders of the two countries, but nothing more; for James had been enabled to raise an army of forty thousand men, which compelled Gloucester to stand on the defensive. In the year 1482, however, matters took a different turn. The duke of Albany, brother of King James, had been imprisoned in the castle of Edinburgh, and had made his escape into France; from whence, after a brief exile, he came to the court of England. Alexander, duke of Albany, laid claim to the Scottish crown, pretending that James was a bastard; and he proposed that if Edward would lend him a good army, he would surrender Berwick, acknowledge himself the vassal of England, renounce all alliance with Louis of France, and if the Church would permit—for he had already two wives—he would marry *one* of Edward's daughters. A treaty to that effect—although Edward must have known he was leaguing himself with a traitor—was signed on the 10th of June at Fotheringay. The dukes of Albany and Gloucester entered Scotland with an army of twenty-five thousand men, and having captured Berwick, marched to Edinburgh, in which they were received without opposition. At that time James was shut up in the castle, whither he had fled for safety from his disaffected nobles; who, while he lay at Lauder towards the borders, had burst into the royal tent at midnight, and had carried off several of his favourites and hung them over the bridge of Lauder. The government of Scotland was almost dissolved; and in this extremity some of the great lords, after having in vain summoned the Scots to their standard to resist the dukes of Albany and Gloucester, sent proposals for a peace with them, which after a brief negotiation was concluded. The principal clauses of this treaty were that the duke of Albany should be a true and faithful subject to his brother James; and that he should be restored to all his estates and honours, and pardoned all his offences. But there was a third party to conciliate. Edward's daughter, Cecily, was contracted to be married to the son of James of Scotland, and he had paid a part of the marriage portion; but it was finally agreed that Edward should have the money restored to him if it was his pleasure the contract should be dissolved, and that he should retain the town and castle of Berwick. The duke of Gloucester returned to England; and so pleased was the nation with the recovery of Berwick, that he received the thanks of parliament for his services.

The fidelity of the duke of Albany to his brother James was but of brief duration. Early in the year 1483 he had again turned traitor, and was intriguing to deprive James of his throne. To that end he opened a fresh negotiation with the English monarch; but at that time Edward had a more important affair in view than that of assisting the treacherous Albany. He concluded a new treaty with him it is true, but it was only to prevent interruption from Scotland while he was engaged in the war he was now meditating. That war was with France. Louis had now offended him beyond forgiveness. That "old fox of France" had long been at war with the House of Burgundy, and while Mary was unmarried he had seized most of her territories. At this time Mary was dead. While at Bruges in the month of February, 1482, she went out one day with her retinue to fly her hawks at the herons, and was thrown from her horse, from which accident, after lingering till the month of March, she died. She left three children: two sons, and a daughter, Margot, who was three years of age. Louis, king of France, was overjoyed at the death of his fair neighbour; for in that event he saw that by a little management he could "round his kingdom by means of union with the House of Burgundy." He never intended that his son, the dauphin, should marry the Princess Elizabeth, the daughter of King Edward; and after some opposition from Maximilian, the husband of the deceased Mary of Burgundy, the dauphin was betrothed to their infant daughter, Margot: her marriage portion being all those provinces which Louis had gained by fraud and force of arms. The contract of this marriage was confirmed by the parliament of Paris, A.D. 1483, and was celebrated with great rejoicings in that city. When Edward heard of this event he was enraged beyond measure. He felt that he had been duped by the "old fox of France." He vowed that he would carry such a war into France as had never been seen in that country. Great preparations were set on foot for that war; but an enemy against whom there is no defence soon put an end to his projects. By long indulgence in every excess, Edward had become enfeebled in body and mind, and his paroxysms of rage at being thus insulted and disgraced by Louis, king of France, brought on an illness, of which he died on the 9th of April, in the forty-second year of his age. Edward was buried in the new chapel of St. George, at Windsor, where also the remains of the ill-fated Henry VI. were afterwards removed: his tomb imparting this moral lesson to the spectator:—

> "Here o'er the ill-fated king the marble weeps;
> And fast beside him, once feared Edward sleeps.
> Whom not the extended Albion could contain
> From old Belerium to the northern main,
> The grave unites; where e'en the great find rest,
> And blended lie the oppressor and the oppressed."

The character of Edward IV. is too strongly marked to be mistaken. He was vindictive, cruel, ambitious, and sensual. In youth he was admired for the beauty of his face and the handsome form of his person; but ere he attained to middle age, he became, by his intemperance, corpulent and bloated. As a warrior few have been more successful; but when the hour of exertion was past, no warrior was ever more eager to rush into pleasure. In private life his address was easy, engaging, and familiar. Holinshed says of his manners that "nothing won more the hearts of the common people, who oftentimes esteem a little courtesy more than a great benefit." Hence it was, that in

spite of his vices and his reign of terror, he retained to the last a great measure of popular favour. If his virtues had been equal to his endowments he would have won for himself a name of high renown in the page of history; but as his career was marked with crime and stained with almost every vice, Edward IV. must be handed down to posterity as one of the most odious monarchs that has ever wielded the English sceptre. In war he was cruel and revengeful; in peace, vicious and dissolute. In a word he was a king of whom it can scarcely be said that he was free from any vice except avarice, the indulgence of which would have bridled him more than his imperious appetites could have brooked. He left issue by his queen, Elizabeth Woodville, two sons and seven daughters: Edward, his eldest son, succeeding him for a brief season on his throne.

SECTION V.

EDWARD V.

EDWARD V. was twelve years old when he began to reign. At the time of his father's death he was residing in Ludlow Castle with a council, amongst whom were his maternal uncle, earl Rivers, and his half brother, Sir Richard Grey. It may be presumed that, before he died, Edward had seen the error of his ways. At all events he seemed to have been anxious that his son at least should be brought up to lead a virtuous life. Only six weeks before his death he drew up ordinances for the regulation of his daily conduct—ordinances which prescribed his morning attendance at mass, his occupation at school, his meals and his sports. Thus, at his meals, no one was to sit with him but such as earl Rivers should allow, and there was to "be read before him noble stories, as behoveth a prince to understand; and that the communication at all times in his presence be of virtue, honour, knowledge, wisdom, and deeds of worship, and of nothing that shall move him to vice." In his last moments, also, Edward showed deep anxiety for the peaceful reign of his son. When on his death-bed he is reported to have called the marquis of Dorset, the queen's son by her first husband, and lord Hastings, his chamberlain, to his side, and implored them to live in amity, uttering these warning words: "If you among yourselves, in a child's reign, fall at debate, many a good man shall perish, and haply he too, and ye too, ere this land find peace again."

When the dying monarch uttered these warning words, it is probable that he feared the minority of his son would prove the occasion of a fresh outbreak between the members of the Woodville family and the ancient nobility of the land. During the latter years of his reign he had been enabled in a great degree to repress their jealousies. The dukes of Gloucester and Buckingham, with the lords Hastings, Howard, and Stanley, and others, had become apparently sincerely reconciled to the queen and her relations and friends, for they had acted in concert with them in the court and in councils with almost unbroken harmony. But there was a secret animosity existing between them; and Edward had scarcely been laid in his tomb at Windsor before the struggle for power between them commenced.

That they might possess the power of the young king, the first object which each of the parties had in view was to obtain and keep possession of his person. As before seen he was at Ludlow Castle when his father died, surrounded by a council entirely composed of the queen's relations and friends. When he heard of his brother's death the duke of Gloucester was in the north, and he hastened to London with a large number of his followers to assist at the coronation of his nephew, which was fixed for the 4th of May. But before he arrived there had been dissensions in the council. The queen and her friends desired to raise an army to conduct Edward from Ludlow Castle to London; but the lord chamberlain, Hastings, and others of the ancient nobility, opposed this measure. Hastings threatened to leave the court if it was persisted in; and it was finally agreed that two thousand men-at-arms should conduct the king to Westminster. Attended by Rivers, Vaughan, Grey, and the prescribed retinue, therefore, the young king set out on his journey. They travelled onward until they reached Northampton. It is said that the duke of Gloucester had celebrated the obsequies of his deceased brother in the minster at York, and had there sworn fealty to Edward V., his example being followed by his train of six hundred knights and squires, all dressed in mourning. From York, too, he wrote letters to the queen, and to her brother, lord Rivers, replete with the warmest professions to them, and of loyalty to young Edward. But it would appear that about the same time he wrote other letters, which, if they did not contain disloyal sentiments, were not expressive of any particular attachment to the queen and her party. There was nothing he dreaded so much as to see the administration in their hands, which was evidently contemplated, inasmuch as he knew they hated him. He designed preventing this; and hence he engaged Henry Stafford, duke of Buckingham, the most powerful nobleman in England, to meet him on the road to London at the head of his numerous vassals. These dukes must have acted in concert thus early in the new reign; for on the same day the king arrived at Northampton, they arrived there also, Gloucester from the north, and Buckingham from the north-west. But the king had been and gone again, for he had been sent forward to Stony Stratford. It is supposed by some writers that he had been sent to lodge that night at Stony Stratford in order to prevent Gloucester seeing his nephew; while on the other hand it is affirmed that Rivers and Grey returned from thence to Northampton to show their respect for Gloucester. There can be no doubt that each party was endeavouring to outmanœuvre the other: the one to keep, and the other to get possession of, the young king's person. But for the evening they met as friends. It was spent in the most pleasant companionship. There was much convivial mirth and pleasantry displayed in the evening party of that 29th of April. Business, also, was transacted over their wine cups. Measures were concerted about the king's remaining journey from Stony Stratford to London, and his approaching coronation. But after Rivers and Grey had departed to

there was a secret consultation between the —princes of the royal blood—and some few ıds, in which "they spent a great part of The result of that consultation was seen . The inn where Rivers and Grey ded, and they were made prisoners. on to Stony Stratford, where the ny were ready to leap on horse- vard, to leave that lodging for ompany, because "it was too t they were not yet to go Vaughan and Sir Richard the young king, weeping brought back to North- attendants were dis- court, under the pain in. It is said that of terror at such ɒe imagined that he ıe friends of his childhood ıus unceremoniously torn from ster did all he could to pacify him. his knees before him, expressed the profession of loyalty and affection for him, assured him, as his loving uncle, that what had been done was for his preservation. It does not appear clear whether the two thousand horse that attended the king were among those who retired on the order to disperse; but one thing is certain, that from this moment he remained a prisoner in the hands of the two "princes of the royal blood"—Gloucester and Buckingham. As for the earl Rivers, lord Grey, Vaughan, and Hawse, they were conveyed northward under a strong guard to Pontefract Castle.

The news of these sudden demonstrations occasioned great commotion in London. Convinced that her ruin and that of her children was fully determined, the queen fled into the sanctuary of Westminster, taking with her her second son, the duke of York, and her five daughters. Meanwhile the partisans of the different parties, in great crowds, and some of them in arms, had meetings and consultations, but no fixed resolutions could be formed, because no one knew what were the real intentions of those who had the king in their possession. The lord Hastings assured the people that the dukes of Gloucester and Buckingham were acting for the public weal, and were right loyal to the king, and there can be little doubt but that such was his belief. At all events, though he himself was desirous of getting rid of the queen-mother and her relations from court, *he* was not prepared to turn traitor to the son of his deceased master and friend. He was heartily attached to the young king, and only meant to raise the duke of Gloucester to the regency. On the 1st of May he sent a messenger at midnight to Rotherham, archbishop of York and chancellor of England, assuring him that the intentions of the dukes were honourable—that they were loyal and all would end well. And at this time Hastings appears to have been confirmed in his conviction that all was right, for he had been summoned to meet them, and had sent his messenger after he had had a conference with them. The queen, however, did not put any faith in the assurances of Hastings; for when Rotherham delivered his message to her she exclaimed:—"A woe with him, for he is one of them that goeth about to destroy me and my blood." It would appear, indeed, that she would take no comfort, for More says, "she sat alone in the rushes, all desolate and dismayed." The archbishop endeavoured to comfort and soothe her alarm, declaring that if her enemies crowned any other king than her son Edward, they would crown his brother, the duke of York, whom they had with them, on the morrow. As a pledge of his own sincerity the chancellor with singular imprudence left the Great Seal with the queen, but becoming sensible of his error he sent a messenger for it and it was returned.

Meanwhile the commotions in London increased. The Thames was full of the boats of the duke of Gloucester's servants who were watching that no man should go to the sanctuary of Westminster, and none should pass unsearched; the citizens gathered in groups to discourse of the events that were passing;

SANCTUARY AT WESTMINSTER.

and the knights and gentlemen were putting on their harness and assembling in companies. In the midst of these commotions a council was held, at which the archbishop of York, as was the custom, produced the Great Seal which he had well-nigh lost. Hastings had returned from his flying visit to the dukes, and at this council he again asserted that the duke of

Gloucester was faithful to the young king. The earl Rivers, and the lord Richard Grey, and others had only been arrested, he said, for matters attempted by them against the two royal dukes, and not for the king's jeopardy. They were to be put on their trial before their peers; but the king was coming up to London to be crowned on the day appointed. He recommended peace and good order in the city, that the coronation might be conducted with all due solemnity. At the same time Hastings could not but admit "that matters were like to come to a field;" but if they did, he added, the authority would "be that side whereof the king himself was." These repeated assurances of Hastings somewhat quieted the Londoners; but there were still fearful misgivings; for while Hastings was endeavouring to allay the general apprehensions, a report was industriously spread abroad that proofs had been obtained that the queen's relations were plotting to destroy the two dukes and others of royal blood, in order that they might govern the young king at their pleasure. As a confirmation of this report, barrels filled with arms were exhibited to the people, which were said to have been the instruments with which the traitors were about to accomplish their bloody work; and the people who saw them came to the conclusion that it would be a work of charity to hang the plotters of such diabolical mischief!

At length the 4th of May, the day of the coronation, arrived. The commotion had been so great that the peaceful and wealthy citizens had earnestly longed for it, that tranquillity might be restored. True to the time, the dukes approached the city with the young king. On arriving at Hornsey Wood, the lord mayor with the sheriffs and aldermen clothed in scarlet, and five hundred of the citizens clad in violet, all mounted on horseback, met them and greeted the king "right reverently." Gloucester entered the city riding bareheaded before his nephew, and exclaiming aloud to the people, "Behold your king." But there was no coronation on that day. The young monarch was lodged in the bishop's palace, where it is said the duke of Gloucester renewed his oath of fealty, in which he was followed by prelates and nobles, and my lord mayor and the aldermen of London. But the bishop's palace was not deemed a place of safety for the royal boy; for two or three days after, at a great council held at Westminster, the duke of Buckingham proposed that he should, for better security, be lodged in the Tower—especially as it was customary for the kings of England to ride from the Tower in state to Westminster on the day before their coronation. Edward was accordingly sent to the Tower; the day of his coronation being now fixed for the 22nd of June.

At this council the duke of Gloucester was appointed protector of the kingdom. Thus exalted, he proclaimed himself, "brother and uncle of the king, protector and defensor, great chamberlain, constable, and lord high admiral of England." The lords in council subsequently summoned fifty lords and gentlemen to attend and receive, as customary before a coronation, the honours of knighthood: those lords and gentlemen being no doubt members of the ancient nobility, and not the friends of the queen. Changes were also made in the government. The Great Seal was taken from the archbishop of York and given to the bishop of London, and other changes were made among the officers of the crown. My lord protector was, indeed, very busy in strengthening his interests. Buckingham for his services received most liberal rewards. He was appointed constable of the royal castles, and keeper of royal forests; and he was also appointed to the government of the principality of Wales. Others were also partakers of Gloucester's favours, although they were bestowed in the king's name, and all grants signed with the royal boy's signet. Thus Lovell had a grant of the castle and honour of Wallingford; Catesby was made chancellor of the earldom of March; and lord Howard was appointed steward of the duchy of Lancaster, south of the Trent. There was a wholesale displacement of those who had held office in the reign of the late king from the highest to the lowest—from the chancellorship to the bailiff of a park; their places being supplied by the protector's own party. And it was not only by these means that Gloucester sought to pave his way to the throne: a man who had abandoned all principles of honour and humanity was soon carried away beyond the reach of fear or precaution. But up to the first week in June there was no indications that he would attempt to thrust his nephew from the throne, or to commit those bloody deeds of which a few days after he was guilty. On the 5th of that month he issued particular letters to the lords and gentlemen summoned by the council to come and receive the honours of knighthood, to appear before the king in the Tower four days before the coronation for that purpose. At that time, therefore, he seems to have had a full intention of crowning his nephew; or if he had not, his secret was kept within his own bosom. When he was appointed protector—to which dignity, as the nearest male of the royal family, he was fairly entitled—no one foresaw any danger to the succession, much less to the lives of the sons of his deceased brother. Had he been accused of contemplating the deaths of the young princes it is probable that he would have exclaimed with one of old—"Am I a dog that I should do such things?" Yet such was the end of his protectorship.

But before such a consummation could be effected there was much bloody work to do. Having strengthened his interests by the promotion of his friends, he no longer hesitated to remove the obstructions which lay in his pathway to the throne. He commenced by the deaths of the prisoners in Pontefract Castle, to which violent and sanguinary measure the duke of Buckingham and even lord Hastings consented. Without any trial or form of process they fell under the axe of the headsman. This was the first act in the tragedy of blood by which he ascended the throne. Having taken this step, he sounded Buckingham and Hastings, his coadjutors in this deed of guilt, as to the part they would take should he attempt to usurp the throne—Buckingham personally, and Hastings by means of Catesby, a lawyer who lived in great intimacy with that nobleman. To Buckingham he represented that the execution of persons so nearly related to the queen as earl Rivers and lord Grey would never pass unpunished; that all the actors in

GLOUCESTER CONDUCTING EDWARD V. INTO LONDON.

that scene were bound for self-preservation to prevent the effect of future vengeance; that it would be impossible to keep the queen from her son for ever, and that she would instil into his mind the thoughts of retaliating, by similar executions, the sanguinary insults committed on her family; that the only method of averting these dangers was to put the sceptre into the hands of one of whose friendship the duke might be assured, and whose years and experience taught him to respect merit and the rights of the ancient nobility; and that the same necessity which had carried them so far in resisting the usurpation of these intruders would justify them in attempting further innovations, and in making, by the national consent, a new settlement of the succession. Gloucester backed these arguments by offers of great rewards if Buckingham would aid him in his enterprise. Buckingham promised his full support, but not so did Lord Hastings. Catesby could do nothing with him. He was impregnable in his allegiance and fidelity to the children of the deceased King Edward, who had honoured him with his friendship. Rather than prove traitorous to them he would run the risk of the vengeance of the queen for the part he had taken in the deaths of her relations. It was a brave resolution, but fatal to his life. Hastings had assisted him in obtaining the regency, and Richard resolved that he should not stand in his way to the throne.

This event seems to have caused a division in the council, for while the majority attended Richard early and late at his residence in Crosby Place, Bishopsgate, the minority, composed of Lord Hastings and others, met in the Tower. Hastings, no doubt, felt that his non-compliance in the protector's views would produce a struggle between them, but he does not appear to have apprehended any danger. Lord Stanley, one of the minority in the council, expressed his uneasiness at the proceedings in Crosby Place, but Hastings assured him that he was at ease on that point, for he had his secret agent there who was sure to inform him of all that was doing among the majority there assembled. Besides, there was a strong garrison in the Tower; what could there be to fear? But there was cause for fear. Richard, duke of Gloucester, "protector and defender of this our realm of England during our young age," as ran the official documents of the young king, had determined to ruin utterly the man whom he despaired of engaging to concur in his usurpation. There had been a divided council, but my lord protector resolved that henceforth the council should be "one and indivisible." On the 13th of June he summoned a council, not in Crosby Place, but in the Tower, where the young king was, and where the minority were wont to assemble. It was summoned to arrange the solemnity of the coronation. Of course Hastings on such an occasion was present, for he longed to see the young king crowned: deeming that then all fears and dangers, if there were any, would be at an end. The council met early in the morning, for when the protector arrived it was only nine o'clock, and he excused himself for being so late by saying that he had overslept himself. But he was in wonderful high spirits on that June morning. He took his place at the council table in the most jovial manner imaginable. But nothing appears to have been said about the coronation. Richard's conversation rather turned upon strawberries! My lord of Ely, he said, had some very good ones in his garden at Holborn, and he should like to have a mess of them. It is some distance from the Tower to Holborn, but my lord of Ely, after expressing a wish he had some better thing ready to his pleasure than a mess of strawberries, sent his servant in hot haste for them. *Then*, says More, "the protector set the lords fast in communing, and thereupon praying them to spare him for a little while, departed thence." We do not read whether my lord of Ely's strawberries ever arrived at the Tower, but if they did, when they came my lord protector was scarcely in a mood to taste them. In about an hour, says More, he returned into the council chamber, "all changed, with a wonderful angry countenance, knitting the brows, frowning and fretting, and gnawing on his lips, and so sat him down in his place." For a time he was silent, but on a sudden he asked what they were worthy to suffer that compassed his destruction; he who was so nearly related to the king and who was entrusted with the administration of the government? Hastings replied that they justly merited the punishment of traitors. The protector's denunciations pointed at the queen and others with her. "Then," he replied, "these traitors are the sorceress, my brother's wife, and Jane Shore, his mistress, with their affinity, for they have by their sorcery and witchcraft withered my body." Then plucking up his doublet sleeve to his elbow, upon his left arm, "he showed a werish, withered arm, and small as it was never other." Every one present saw that my lord protector was seeking a quarrel. Every one knew that Gloucester's arm was as it ever had been from his birth, "werish and withered;" and that Shore's wife, who had been the king's mistress, was not at all likely to be in the queen's counsels. She hated mistress Shore, but it is affirmed that Hastings doted on her, and after a brief pause he replied, "Certainly, my lord, if they have so heinously done they be worthy heinous punishment." "What," rejoined the protector, "dost thou reply to me with 'ifs' and with 'ands?' I tell thee they have so done, and that I will make good on thy body, traitor." "And therewith," says More, in his graphic relation of the scene, "as in a great rage he clapped his fist upon the door a great rap. At which token given, one cried 'treason' without the chamber. Therewith a door clapped, and in came there men, rushing in harness, as many as the chamber might hold. And anon the protector said to the Lord Hastings, 'I arrest thee, traitor!' 'What, me, my lord?' quoth he. 'Yes, thee, traitor,' quoth the protector. And another let fly at the Lord Stanley, who shrunk at the stroke, and fell under the table, or else his head had been cleft to the teeth; for as shortly as he shrank, yet ran the blood about his ears. Then were they all quietly bestowed in divers chambers, except the lord chamberlain, whom the protector bade speed and shrine him apace, 'for by St. Paul,' quoth he, 'I will not to dinner till I see thy head off.' It booted him not to ask why, but heavily he took a priest at adventures and made a short shrift, for a longer

would not be suffered, the protector made such haste to dinner: which he might not go to till this were done for the saving of his oath. So was he brought forth into the green beside the chapel within the Tower, and his head laid down upon a log of wood and there stricken off." Moreton, bishop of Ely, who had such "good strawberries in his garden" at Holborn, and had so kindly sent for a dish of them for my lord protector, was arrested in spite of his politeness, and was committed to the custody of the duke of Buckingham. The ex-chancellor—the archbishop of York who left the Great Seal with the queen—and other counsellors, were also committed prisoners in different chambers of the Tower. To carry on the farce of his accusations, the protector summoned mistress Shore to answer before the council for sorcery and witchcraft; but as no proofs which could be received even in that dark age were produced against her, he directed her to be tried in the spiritual court for her adulteries and lewdness. She was sentenced by the bishop of London to do penance for her alleged vicious life, which she did upon a Sunday in a white sheet with a taper in her hand.

The death of Lord Hastings, and the committal of other members of the council, caused great agitation in the city. According to More, there were "ominous looks and timid whisperings." It is likely that the Londoners would have revenged his death, but Richard knew how to avert the danger. Having had his dinner, and perchance some of my lord of Ely's fine strawberries for his dessert, he sent in all haste for many substantial men out of the city into the Tower. It was to hear his tale of what had happened. More says, at their coming the protector and Buckingham "stood harnessed in old, ill-faring briganders, such as no man should ween that they would vouchsafe to have put upon their backs except that some sudden necessity constrained them. And then the protector showed them that the lord chamberlain and others of his conspiracy had contrived to have suddenly destroyed him and the duke there the same day in the council. And what they intended further was as yet not well known. Of which, their treason, we never had knowledge before ten of the clock the same forenoon. Which sudden fear drove them to put on for their defence such harness as came next to hand. And so God had holpen them, that the mischief turned upon them that would have done it." These "substantial citizens" were required to report all this to the Londoners in general; and it may be presumed that the tale was believed, for their "ominous looks" was not followed by any commotion adverse to the protector's government.

The plot thickened. The protector, who still continued to wear the mask of loyalty to the king, held a council on the 16th of June. At that council it was represented that it would be derogatory to the dignity of the duke of York to remain in sanctuary at Westminster among murderers at the time of his brother's coronation, and a deputation was appointed to wait upon the queen and persuade her to permit the young prince to leave the sanctuary. Elizabeth long opposed his removal, urging that the duke of York by living in the sanctuary, was not only secure himself, but also gave security to the king, whose life no one would dare attempt while his successor and avenger remained in safety. But Elizabeth's opposition was vain. There were "great plenty of harnessed men at Westminster," and had she not finally yielded consent the young duke would have been taken from his place of refuge by force. It is said that Cardinal Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, who was at the head of this deputation, persuaded the queen by "gentle words" to give up her son to him, promising his safety; but it is more likely that she yielded rather to the conviction of the uselessness of resistance than to the "gentle words" of the cardinal primate. Elizabeth embraced her beautiful boy, and delivered him to "my lord cardinal, my lord chancellor, and other many lords temporal," and then burst into tears, having a presentiment that her child was lost. Richard was carried to the Tower, and there secured with his brother.

That brother, on the 17th of June, in effect ceased to be king: the last act of his royal authority being to give commissions to three persons to provide oxen and sheep for the use of the royal household for the next six months. It was, however, on that day that my lord protector openly threw off the mask of loyalty, which he had worn in order to deceive the young monarch and the people. It is impossible to discover at what time he formed the plan of supplanting his nephew and placing himself on the throne. If he had formed it before he took the oath of fealty to the young king, then he was guilty of the foulest hypocrisy and the most infamous impiety. According to some historians it *was* thus early formed, but their testimony seems doubtful. At the same time a plan for dethroning a young prince who had succeeded his father with the general consent of the people, could not have been formed and brought to maturity in a day, or even in a week. It is manifest from the preceding narrative that his desire to mount the throne was no sudden impulse. All his recent proceedings tended to that end, for by them he had rid himself of all those who might have proved obstacles in the path of his ambition. Having, therefore, cleared his way, and having the two sons of his deceased brother in his power, there was now no longer any reason why he should not claim openly that which he had been aiming at with such marvellous cunning in secret. But on what grounds could Richard, duke of Gloucester, aspire to the throne of England? Had not the elder son of Edward IV. a better claim than he? Most certainly. A good and sufficient cause, whether true or false, had therefore to be shown why my lord protector aspired to the kingly dignity. And that cause was raked out of the known immoralities of his brother Edward. On the 22nd of June, the very day when young Edward was to have been crowned, there was a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, the preacher being Dr. Ralph Shaw, brother of the lord mayor of London. My lord protector was there, and so was Buckingham, and many noble lords, and many more citizens. The doctor took for his text these words: "The multiplying brood of the ungodly shall not thrive, nor take deep rooting from bastard slips, nor lay any fast foundation." The giving out such a remarkable text

ıave riveted the attention of his hearers to word that followed. It was clear from that at a sermon of a very singular character would ıched from it. No doubt the doctor prepared arers in his preamble for the wonderful tale formed the burden of his oration. That burden ıat the two young princes in the Tower were mate children; inasmuch as Edward, their had in the very beginning of his reign, before ew Elizabeth, the widow of Sir Thomas Grey stinely married Eleanor, the widow of the Lord :, of Sudely. This disclosure was founded on a id to have been now first related by Stillington, of Bath and Wells. Stillington had formerly ne of King Edward's council, but falling into e had been removed from court, and made r. At this time, however, he was ransomed, is said to have paid a good round sum for his , although it is very probable that the pre- secret he divulged may have been the price of nsom. Comines says that "the bishop dis- l to the duke of Gloucester that he married Edward IV. to a beautiful young lady, which marriage had taken place before the king's ge with the Lady Elizabeth Woodville." And that the bishop having discovered this mystery duke of Gloucester, "he gave his assistance to ecution of the barbarous designs of the duke." ıe fact of such a marriage is extremely impro- for the Lady Sudely would never have sub- to see another placed by the side of Edward throne had she been married to him, without go blabbing the secret. But it may have ed my lord of Ely's views to have told this my Lord Gloucester, and it certainly answered otector's ends to put it into the mouth of the r preacher, Dr. Shaw, that he might promul- from the pulpit at Paul's Cross to the people. is was not all the infamy which the doctor upon the memory of the dead King Edward,

ST. PAUL'S CROSS.

and to which his own brother, Richard of Gloucester, eagerly listened, instead of commanding him to cease his foul-mouthed slander. Having boldly pronounced the two young princes in the Tower to be illegitimate, he took up the scandal which had been propagated, first by the duke of Burgundy, and afterwards by the duke of Clarence, expressing his learned doubts whether Edward, the late king, was in reality the son of his reputed father, Richard, duke of York, seeing that there was no resemblance in their features. Then breaking out in a panegyric on the duke of Gloucester, he exclaimed: "Behold this excellent prince, the express image of his noble father, the genuine descendant of the House of York; bearing no less in the virtues of his mind than in the features of his countenance the character of the gallant Richard, once your hero and favourite; he alone is entitled to your allegiance; he must deliver you from the dominion of all intruders; he alone can restore the lost glory and honour of the nation." It had been concerted that at the conclusion of Shaw's sermon Richard should be hailed as king, and some few did cry "God save King Richard!" but the general audience preserved a profound silence. The old chronicler, Fabyan, who was then in London, and probably present at the sermon, says: "It was to the great abusion of all the audience, except such as favoured the matter, which were few in number, if the truth or plainness might be showed." The eloquent doctor overacted his part, for the audience were not prepared to believe that either their late king or his children were bastards.

But what availed the silence of the audience at Paul's Cross? Richard was not to be turned aside from the path of his ambition. If one expedient had failed, another might succeed; and, accordingly, another was tried. My lord mayor of London, as well as Dr. Shaw, his brother, was in Richard's interests, and by virtue of his mayoralty he called an assembly of the citizens at Guildhall. This time the duke of Buckingham was the orator. Fabyan highly commends the fluent oratory of the noble duke on this occasion, which he declares was "without any impediment of spitting." Buckingham dilated on the tyranny and extortion of the late King Edward. He had reduced numbers to beggary by his benevolences; and he had disgraced numerous honest families by his illicit amours. He went over all the topics touched upon in Shaw's sermon, and declared that which was not true, that the lords and commons of the north had sworn never to be governed by a bastard. Buckingham's sugared words had more effect than Shaw's eloquence, for some of the poorer sort threw up their bonnets and cried, "Long live King Richard!" but many of the more respectable citizens required time for deliberation. But no time was given. Buckingham chose to take the cries of the few as the voice of the many, and giving them his most hearty thanks, and promising them abundant favours and much felicity in the coming reign, he desired the lord mayor, aldermen, and citizens, to meet him next day to petition the protector to take upon him the crown. At the same time he warned them, that as my lord protector was a man of extreme modesty, and one who had the deepest affection for his brother's children, he *might* reject their petition!

On the 25th of June there was a scene at Baynard's Castle, where my lord protector was then residing. There was a large concourse of nobles and citizens assembled there; the duke of Buckingham, and the lord mayor and aldermen of London being among them. They were seeking an audience with the lord protector on an affair of great importance. The modest duke was amazed and alarmed at such a concourse of people at his castle gates. He was fearful that there was some design against his person. Nevertheless, after a little demur, he took courage, and granted the desired audience. The assembly came bending low into his presence. The noble duke who could make a speech "without any impediment of spitting," was again the orator. He harangued most fluently on the miseries of the late reign, the illegality of Edward's marriage, and the consequent illegitimacy of his children, and the protector's undoubted title to the crown; concluding with an earnest request, in the name of the assembly before him, to take that crown of which he was so well worthy, and to which he was so well entitled. My lord protector was taken aback at such a proposal. He was utterly surprised at it. All that the duke had uttered was true to the very letter, but his love for the children of his brother—albeit they were bastards—was greater than his love for the crown. Was there ever such a brother, and such a loving uncle? Some people are born to greatness, others have it thrust upon them. Returning to his charge, Buckingham told him in plain words that none of Edward's children should reign over them; and hinted that if he persisted in not accepting the crown, they would offer it to another who would not refuse it. Gloucester was startled at this announcement. He hesitated, desired a day to consider, but kindly gave them cause to hope that he would listen to reason and importunity!

The last act of this political farce, or rather tragedy, was acted on that morrow. There was again a scene at Baynard's Castle. All the prelates, lords, and great men of my lord protector's party, assembled there to make him king in spite of his modesty and his love for his nephews. They went armed with a petition, wherein his sure and true title was so evidently showed and declared, that he no longer hesitated to accept the crown. In this document the illegitimacy of the late king was suppressed, but his marriage with Eleanor Boteley was more strongly than ever insisted upon. "As Edward," it set forth, "during his life and Elizabeth lived together sinfully and damnably in adultery, against the law of God and of his Church, so it appeared evidently, and followed that all the issuing children of the said King Edward be bastards." To get rid of the children of the duke of Clarence, the elder brother of Richard, the attainder for treason against that prince, was produced as a bar to their pretensions; and, finally, he was pressed to mount the throne as his by right of birth, and by lawful election of the three estates of the land. "Whereupon," to use his own language, "the king's highness, notably assisted by well near all the lords spiritual and temporal of this realm, went the same day unto the palace at Westminster, and there in such royal honourable apparelled, within the great hall there took possession and declared his mind, that the same day he would begin to reign upon his people; and from thence rode solemnly to the cathedral church of London, and was received there with procession, with great congratulation and acclamation of all the people in every place." Such was the inflated account of his accession, which Richard sent from his own royal pen to the garrison at Calais, to induce them to take an oath of fealty to him; but which they nobly refused to take, because they had sworn fealty to Edward V.

SECTION VI.

RICHARD III.

Richard III. did not ascend the throne of England trusting entirely to the clearness of his title. Nor did he place implicit confidence in the loyalty of the nobles and people towards his person. Many had hailed him king who hated him; and many more looked upon him as an usurper. But he was well protected with armed men. He might, indeed, be said to have ascended the throne like many of the usurping emperors of old Rome: on the shields of warriors. He had himself brought with him to London a great number of armed followers, and his chief accomplice, the duke of Buckingham, had brought a still greater number, and had sent for many more from Wales. An army of about five thousand men had also arrived from the north. A contemporary historian asserts that there was "a terrible and unheard-of number of armed men" in London, when he was struggling up the path which led to the throne. a path which, if not made slippery with blood, was at least too copiously sprinkled with it. The troops gathered together on this occasion did not, it would appear, make a very gay appearance, for it is recorded that the citizens of London, who were accustomed to see troops well-apparelled and well-equipped, laughed at their shabby dress and rusty armour. But these troops were formidable, and ready at Richard's bidding to do any bloody work. Their commander was well known, for he was Sir Richard Ratcliffe, who had given many proofs that he was capable of perpetrating the most horrid and atrocious deeds. He it was who had executed the Earl Rivers and others at Pontefract Castle, and such a man was to be dreaded. No wonder, therefore, that some of the citizens of London threw up their bonnets and cried, "Long live King Richard!" and that others preserved a solemn silence. These troops, therefore, with "shabby dress and rusty armour," had no slight share in the honour or the infamy of this almost unexampled revolution.

Richard was proclaimed king on the 27th of June: on which day he delivered the Great Seal to one of his prominent supporters—the bishop of Lincoln. Preparations for his coronation were scarcely needed, for they had already been made for that of his nephew. Every one's robes were ready, except his own as king, and they were soon prepared. From his coronation-roll, which is still extant, it would appear that robes were ordered for Lord Edward, son of the late King Edward IV., and his attendants, but it seems probable that they were countermanded. At all events, they

were never worn. If that injured nephew *had* walked in the train at his uncle's coronation, a circumstance which is nowhere recorded, it might have been the signal for a counter-revolution, for the sight of the helpless and degraded young prince would have excited compassion for him, and indignation against his uncle and oppressor in every feeling breast. It is evident that Richard felt this, and that therefore the design was laid aside. In truth, Fabyan records that after Richard accepted the sovereignty, "the prince of right, Edward V., with his brother, the duke of York, was put under surer keeping in the Tower, in such wise that they never came again abroad." The archbishop of York and Lord Stanley fared better; for having complied with the times, that is, submitted to Richard, they were set at liberty before the coronation, and took part in the ceremony. About the same time John, Lord Howard, was created duke of Norfolk, and appointed high steward.

Richard was crowned on the 6th of July; Ann Neville, his consort, youngest daughter of the earl of Warwick, sharing in his exaltation. To all outward appearances there was great unanimity displayed on this occasion. The ceremony was conducted with the usual magnificence, and the attendance of prelates, nobles, and knights was such, that gave him no cause for suspicion or disaffection. Abbots and bishops were there with their mitres and croziers in full force. Northumberland was there with the pointless sword; Stanley bore the mass; Suffolk carried the sceptre; Lincoln held aloft the cross and ball; Norfolk had the honour of carrying the crown; and Buckingham the no less high honour of holding up the king's train. Kent, Lovell, and Surrey also were there carrying swords, and bishops walked on the side of the king. Nor was the queen less honoured. She was preceded by earls and barons; her train was borne by my lady of Richmond, and twenty other ladies followed her. As usual, the ceremony was followed by a banquet, and at the second course there "came riding into the hall Sir Robert Dymoke, the king's champion, and his horse trapped with white silk and red, and himself in white harness, and the heralds of arms standing on a stage amongst all the company. Then came riding up before the king his champion, and there declared before all the people if there be any man will say aught against King Richard the Third why he should not pretend the crown. And anon all the people were in peace awhile. And when he had all said, anon all the hall cried King Richard, all with one voice."

From all this it may be gathered that the accession of the duke of Gloucester to the crown was not altogether an unsanctioned usurpation, resting upon his own resolute will only, and supported by a few unscrupulous partisans. There was no doubt much false-heartedness displayed on the day of the coronation, but still there was an undoubted sanction given to the usurpation by the presence of so numerous an assembly. And Richard was not wanting in gratitude for the support thus given him on the day of his exaltation. King Edward had amassed considerable treasures for his intended expedition into France, and these enabled him to reward his friends or accomplices. His northern forces were sent home amply rewarded, and estates and honours fell thick and fast upon his chief accomplice, the duke of Buckingham. Nothing was left undone that could in any way tend to secure his throne. Friends received rich rewards, and enemies were won over or guarded against. Ambassadors were sent to several foreign princes to announce his accession and cultivate their friendship. His envoy to the court of Brittany had a high authority given him. He was to negotiate any business he thought proper, even though it was of such a nature as to require a special mandate: an authority which plainly points at a secret negotiation about the earl of Richmond, probably with a view of getting him into his power. At the same time the countess of Richmond was a dear friend of the queen's, and her husband, Lord Stanley, was made steward of the household; that Stanley, whose head had been nearly "cleft to the teeth" on the day when his friend, Lord Hastings, was barbarously murdered.

Having settled all his affairs in London, Richard, with his queen and their son, made a progress or circuit through the country. He desired to be a popular monarch, and there is no better means for a king or a queen to obtain popularity than by mingling among their subjects. He spent some days at Oxford, where, at the request of the university, he ordered the release of the bishop of Ely, of Strawberry celebrity. He was committed to the custody of the duke of Buckingham, and this act of grace raised him high in the estimation of the learned men of Oxford. Then he visited Gloucester and Coventry, and everywhere where he went, he raised great expectations of a mild and equitable reign. While he was at Gloucester, the duke of Buckingham left the court, and it is said he quitted it in the most perfect good humour, nothing, as yet, having disturbed the harmony which existed between them. Early in August, Richard was at Tewkesbury, and from thence he went to Warwick and York. He entered York on the 31st of August, whither crowds of the nobility, clergy, and gentry of the north came to greet his majesty. Desiring to please them, and secure their favour, Richard entertained them with another coronation. Rotheram, archbishop of York, crowned him and his queen in the cathedral church on the 8th of September, and on the same day he created his son Edward, then eight years of age, prince of Wales. All this was very pleasant, but the charm was about to be broken. At the end of September he was at Pomfret, and while there, he heard of a wide-spread disaffection. A storm was gathering around his throne, which threatened to shake it to its very foundations Scarcely had he left London when the people of Kent, Essex, Sussex, Hampshire, Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, Berkshire, and other southern counties, no longer overawed by his presence, and that of his northern and Welsh armies, began to murmur at the recent events. Meetings were held, and associations formed, for releasing Edward V. from the Tower, and restoring him to the throne.

But they were too late; Edward and his brother, the duke of York, were dead and buried. What was the fate of these princes? Fabyan, who was sheriff of London in the year 1493, when Richard was making his progress throughout the country, says, that the

ommon report was that he had put the two sons of his brother to death in the Tower. Sir Thomas More, who lived shortly after, and who professes to have heard the particulars from those who were worthy of credence, is more explicit. He relates that Sir Robert Brackenbury, constable of the Tower, received a message from Richard, by one of his pages, commanding him to murder the two young princes. Brackenbury, however, refused to commit the crime: he declined the office of a murderer. More goes on to say, that Sir James Tyrrel, master of the horse, was sent from Warwick with a commission to command in the Tower one night; and in that one night two ruffians—Miles Forrest and John Dighton—smothered the two young princes in their beds, and caused them to be buried under a staircase in the Tower. The subject whether these princes were murdered or not has been much controverted: chiefly from the fact that, in the next reign a youth, commonly called Peter Warbeck, claimed to be the identical duke of York, who had escaped from his unnatural uncle. But there seems to be very little doubt that these two young princes were most foully murdered. It is said that Richard, displeased with the mode of burial adopted by the ruffians, gave orders that they should be taken from their prison grave, and interred in consecrated ground. Richard's chaplain was deputed to see this done, and it is related that it *was* done, and that, as the chaplain died soon after, the place of their burial remained unknown. Henry VII. made search for them in vain. Had he, however, searched for them at the foot of the staircase, it seems certain he might have found them. If the chaplain of Richard had received such an order, it amounts almost to an absolute certainty he never obeyed it. In the year 1674, a circumstance occurred, which has been held to be a decisive corroboration of More's narrative. In that year some alterations were going on in the White Tower; and in making a new staircase into the chapel, some bones were found under the old staircase, whose proportions were answerable to the ages of the royal youths. Charles II. caused those bones to be interred in Henry VII.'s chapel, where a latin inscription upon marble, records the discovery of the remains of Edward V. and the duke of York; the decided nature of which inscription shows that, in the seventeenth century there was an absolute belief that the royal youths so died, and were so buried, as More relates. The character of Richard, also, would lead to the belief that he was guilty of their deaths. It was a feature in that character not to encounter danger with courage, but rather to avert it, if possible, by crooked and unscrupulous means. When he found reason to expect a change of popular feeling in favour of the rightful heirs, it would be quite consistent with his views to anticipate it by a crime; nor is there any reason to suppose he would hesitate, either as to the act itself, or the means employed. The murder seems to have been ordered in the course of his progress, and to have been perpetrated while he was at Leicester—from August 17th to the 19th—for he was at Nottingham when he was apprised of it, namely, August 22nd, and no doubt he flattered himself when the news arrived that now, indeed, he was a king, and that his son, whom, as we have seen, he a few days after, while at York, created prince of Wales, would succeed to his throne.

But he was mistaken. Punishment inevitably, sooner or later, follows crime. There was deep popular grief when it was discovered that the two young princes were dead. And there was also deep indignation. Every one concluded that they had perished by the hand of violence, and Richard speedily lost the support of the nation.

Whether the deaths of the two young princes had anything to do with the disaffection of one whose interests, above all others in the kingdom, he was anxious to secure, is by no means clear. It is certain, however, that at this time, his chief accomplice, Henry, duke of Buckingham, was secretly plotting his destruction. It is impossible to discover the real motives that determined Buckingham to dethrone the king, whose enthronement he had effected. It is probable that his perfect knowledge of his own, and of Richard's character, was his principal motive. It was impossible that any real friendship could subsist inviolate, between two men of such corrupt minds as Richard and Buckingham. They had plotted together the death of Earl Rivers and others, while they were professing the greatest friendship for them: might not Richard, while he was lavishing honours and rewards on Buckingham, be plotting his death? and would it not be better for him to ruin Richard than to be ruined by him? Such might have been his thoughts; and my lord of Ely, who grew such fine strawberries in his garden at Holborn, who was with Buckingham at Brecknock castle, and who was one of the most subtle men of the time, might have increased his fears, and strengthened his resolve. It is believed by some historians that Buckingham had discovered an intention, on the part of Richard, to ruin him, and that this begat his first discontent. It is related, also, that Richard had made him a grant of that part of the Hereford estate which belonged to his family, but which had been escheated to the crown, during the rule of the Yorkists, and also of the high office of constable, which had long been held by inheritance, in his ancestors of the Bohun family; but that, sensible of the danger which might ensue from conferring such an immense property, and such a high dignity, on a man of so turbulent a disposition, Richard afterwards raised difficulties about the execution of his own grant. If such was the case, it would have been a powerful motive for Buckingham's rebellion against the king of his own creation. But, whatever Buckingham's motive was, it is certain, that very soon after Richard's accession, he began to form a conspiracy against the government, and attempted to overthrow that usurpation which he himself had so zealously contributed to establish.

But who, now the sons of Edward IV. were sleeping the sleep of death, was to be king? Buckingham had no claim to the throne, nor does he appear to have had any serious intention of aspiring to it. But somebody must be king, instead of Richard. To endure such a bloody usurper seemed to draw disgrace upon the nation, and to be attended with danger to every individual distinguished by birth, merit, or services. Besides, Richard was a king, whose claim to the throne was "baseless as a vision;" and his title had

never been acknowledged by any national assembly. Such, now, were the sentiments entertained towards him, by those who had been his friends, as well as by his avowed enemies. All parties were united in such sentiments, and the Lancastrians, so long oppressed, and of late so much discredited, began to feel their hopes revive, and anxiously expected the consequence of these extraordinary events. In times past, Buckingham's family had been devoted to the Lancastrian interest, and he himself, by his mother, a daughter of Edmund, duke of Somerset, was allied to the house of Lancaster. Hence, when he broke with Richard, he was easily induced to espouse the cause of that house, and to endeavour to restore it to its ancient prosperity. And in this he was encouraged by my lord of Ely, who was a zealous Lancastrian, and who had wrongs to revenge. By his exhortations, the duke cast his eye towards the young earl of Richmond, as the only person who could free the nation from the tyranny of King Richard.

Henry, earl of Richmond, had but slight, if any, pretensions to the crown. He was descended from an illegitimate son of John of Gaunt, by Catherine Swynford, whom he married in the last year of his life. At their marriage, it is true, John of Gaunt procured the legitimation of his illicit offspring by parliament, but in that act of legitimation they were expressly excluded from any claim to the crown. Besides, there were at this time several legitimate descendants—princes and princesses—of John of Gaunt by his second wife, Constantia, heiress of Castile. But these were too far distant, and none of them ever appear to have entertained any thoughts of asserting their claim to the crown of England. There were, also, several members of the house of York, whose titles were better than any of John of Gaunt's posterity—legitimate or illegitimate. But the choice of Buckingham, and the malcontents generally, fell on the earl of Richmond. And, in truth, he possessed many advantages which recommended him as the most proper person to set up in opposition to Richard. He was in the prime of life, and in the full vigour of his intellect. The Lancastrian party had long considered him as the representative of the house of Lancaster. Edward IV. had known this, and Richard III. knew it, and both had sought to get him into their power. There was only one thing against him, therefore, namely, his defective title; but that it was resolved by Buckingham, and those with whom he acted in concert, to remedy. It was proposed—and a wise proposal it was, so far as human foresight could discern—to supply the defect in that title by uniting in marriage Henry, earl of Richmond, and Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Edward IV., and thereby mingle the Red with the White Rose, and thus put an end to that fatal quarrel which had so long desolated England. It is said that the countess of Richmond and the widowed queen of Edward IV. entered warmly into this scheme, and if so, it is certain that Elizabeth verily believed that her two sons were lost to her for ever; that she might go to them, but they would never return to her. Elizabeth was still in the sanctuary when this scheme was divulged to her by a Welsh physician who had access to her; and no doubt revenge for the murder of her brother and her sons, apprehension for her surviving family, and indignation against her own confinement, added to the warmth she is said to have felt at the proposal that her daughter should espouse Henry, earl of Richmond, although he *was* a member of the hated house of Lancaster.

The plan, as Hume observes, being thus laid upon the solid foundation of good sense and sound policy, it was secretly communicated to the chief actors of both parties in all the counties of England, and a wonderful alacrity appeared in every order of men to forward its success and completion. It was, however, impossible that so extensive a conspiracy could be conducted in so secret a manner as entirely to escape the jealous and vigilant eye of Richard. Yet it would appear that it was somewhat "late in the season" when Richard became fully apprised of the danger by which his mushroom throne was surrounded. Communications had been going to and fro from England and Brittany between Richmond and his friend Buckingham and others before he discovered it. At length, however, within a few days of that fixed for the rising, the 18th of October, he became aware of his critical position. He was still making his progress, and he summoned his friends in the north to meet him at Leicester. That summons was readily answered. He had sent the army of the north home from London after his coronation, well content with the gold and silver he found in the treasury of his predecessor, and the men of the north could not disobey the summons of such a munificent monarch. A considerable army gathered round his standard.

Richard was thus prepared when the day of insurrection arrived. Henry was proclaimed on that day by the marquis of Dorset at Exeter; by the bishop of Salisbury at Devizes; by the men of Kent at Maidstone; by those of Berkshire at Newbury; and by Buckingham himself at Brecknock. Steeped as Richard was in crime from first to last in his public career, he maintained a high tone of morality. He issued a proclamation in which he denounced his enemies as traitors, adulterers, and bawds: men whose object was to let or hinder virtue, and maintain vice. A price was set upon the heads of Buckingham and the principal leaders. True to his engagement, Henry, earl of Richmond, appeared off the coast of Devonshire with a fleet, but none of the confederates were there to meet him. In that October there occurred such an inundation of rain as had not been known in the memory of man. The Severn, and other rivers in the neighbourhood of Wales, where Buckingham had taken up arms, were rendered impassable, and prevented him from joining his friends in the heart of England. It was in vain that he sought for a passage across the Severn; and the people of Herefordshire, Worcester, and Gloucester, who had no affection for him and his Welsh army, would not help him. On the contrary, they either destroyed or defended all the bridges thrown over that river. The consequence was that his Welsh followers deserted and betook themselves to their mountains. Their superstition led them to believe that, by the extraordinary flood, it was evident Heaven fought against them. Thus deserted, Buckingham fled and concealed himself, and his failure induced the rest of the confederates to

disperse. He took shelter in the house of Bannister, an old servant of his family, who basely betrayed him. Richard had marched with his army from Leicester to Salisbury, and it was there where the captive was brought to him; who, as might have been expected, was immediately ordered to be executed. He was beheaded in the market-place. The other confederates dispersed. The chiefs fled to the Continent: but some of inferior note, the most conspicuous of whom was St. Leger, a knight who had married Richard's sister, the duchess of Exeter, were taken and put to death. The fleet of Richmond had been scattered by a storm, and he returned to Brittany. Such a total failure would have disheartened most men from making any further attempt, but we find that on his return he and the marquis of Dorset, who had fled into Brittany, again met to devise new plans, and that, in the cathedral of Vannes, on Christmas day, they pledged themselves to renew the invasion; Richmond, at the same time, swearing that if he gained the crown, he would marry Elizabeth, the daughter of Edward IV.

Meanwhile Richard returned to the capital. The citizens had scarcely any choice left but to receive him with honour, for he came as a victor over his enemies. He was met at Kingston by my lord mayor and aldermen with about five hundred citizens, all nobly mounted and richly dressed, who conducted him to Westminster. He spent his Christmas at Westminster with great pomp, and its festivities were scarcely over when he ventured to call a parliament: the first and last called during his reign. That parliament, which met on the 23rd of January, 1484, was all obedient to his will. It confirmed the petition which had been presented by Buckingham and others at Baynard Castle; declared him lawful king by birth, inheritance, free election, consecration, and coronation; and entailed the crown on his posterity, beginning with his son Edward, who had been created prince of Wales. A bill of attainder, also, was passed against the "traitors" who had sought his dethronement: some of the forfeited estates being retained for the crown, and others given to gentlemen, chiefly of the north, who had proved faithful to his cause. And this parliament did something more than confirm Richard's claims, and attaint all those who had been engaged in this revolt. In the petition presented to the protector at Baynard Castle, were these remarkable words:—"For certainly we be determined rather to aventure, and commit us to the peril of our life and jeopardy of death, than to live in such thraldom and bondage as we have lived long time heretofore, oppressed and injured by extortions and new impositions against the laws of God and man, and the liberty, old policy, and laws of this realm, wherein every Englishman is inherited." Edward IV. had plundered his subjects under the name of benevolences; and a statute was now passed to free the subject from them, denouncing them as "new and unlawful inventions;" as the cause of "great penury and wretchedness;" and ordaining that no such exactions shall in future be made, but that they be "annulled for ever." This act was certainly a great boon to the nation, and others were passed of a popular nature; Richard being ardently desirous of reconciling the people to his usurpation. The liberties of the nation were certainly not directly impaired by that usurpation, but had he long retained power there is no knowing to what extent they might have been, as his whole character displays the true features of a tyrant. At all events, as Hallam observes of his usurpation, "From an act so deeply tainted with moral guilt, as well as so violent in all its circumstances, no substantial benefit was likely to spring."

One of the measures of this parliament was to annul all letters patent granting estates to "Elizabeth, late wife of Sir John Grey." By this measure the unfortunate princess was reduced to penury. She was still in the sanctuary of Westminster, and Richard now aimed at making her poverty and disgrace subservient to his stability on the throne. Although his parliament had declared the children of his brother illegitimate, the Yorkists as a body were inclined to consider the princess Elizabeth heiress to the crown. Richard himself seems to have been convinced of this, and to have known that the declaration of the illegitimacy of Elizabeth and her sisters had no foundation in justice or truth. He was aware of the project of uniting her to Henry, earl of Richmond, in order to mend his title to the crown: what if he could prevent it, by uniting her with his own son Edward? Such now became his aim. To that end Richard opened a correspondence with his brother's widow in the sanctuary of Westminster. He did not, it is true, make such a proposal in plain terms at once, but that was evidently the end he had in view when he invited Elizabeth and her daughters to come forth from their sanctuary, and take shelter under his own fostering wing. One would have supposed that Elizabeth would have spurned any overtures made to her by the murderer of her children, her brother, and her friends, and she does appear to have made some demur in the first instance, although she finally too readily accepted his offers of protection. But before she did accept it she had some guarantee for the safety of herself and her daughters. On the 1st of March the king, in the presence of the lords spiritual and temporal, and the mayor and aldermen of London, swore upon the holy Evangelists that if Elizabeth and her daughters Elizabeth, Cecile, Anne, Katherine, and Bridget would leave their sanctuary, and be guided, ruled, and demeaned by him, he would see that they should be in surety of their lives, and suffer no hurt or imprisonment; but that they should have everything necessary as his kinswomen. He would find her daughters gentlemen born for husbands, and give them marriage portions, and she should receive out of his own purse seven hundred marks annually for her support. Thus secured from further wrongs, by the oath of a king in whom no trust could be placed, Elizabeth left her place of refuge. She and her daughters once more appeared at the court of Westminster, and every attention was paid to her daughters. Richard's design, indeed, now became transparent. His son, then eleven years of age, was to marry the princess Elizabeth although he and his parliament had denounced her as a bastard, and thus his rival Richmond would be wholly and entirely supplanted. But scarcely had this design been formed when death set it aside. After the dissolution of parliament, Richard and his

queen made a second progress into the north, and while at Nottingham, the very place where he had received the news of the two young princes in the Tower, tidings reached him that his own son had expired *suddenly* at Middleham Castle. Richard and his queen are represented as being almost mad with grief at their loss; as being bowed to the earth by this sudden calamity. We doubt whether Richard's grief was as poignant as the old historians record; if it was, it did not long continue. In truth, he had too many enemies to watch to allow him to sit down in hopeless grief. Intelligence arrived from his ambassadors at the court of Brittany that the earl of Richmond and the English exiles were preparing for a renewed attempt to dethrone him. To counteract this, he commenced a negotiation with the duke of Brittany to deliver him up. It is related that a bargain was at this time struck for his surrender; but Richmond had secret friends in the English court, who apprised him of his danger, and he and his fellow exiles fled into France, where he claimed the protection of Charles VIII.; or rather Madame de Beaujeu, who had the chief direction of the affairs of her brother during his minority. About the same time the earl of Oxford, one of the most faithful adherents of the House of Lancaster, escaped from his prison at Ham and joined him, and other adherents came flocking to him; so that Richmond was more dangerous in France than he had been while sojourning in Brittany.

During this year Richard made great preparations for the possible invasion. Meanwhile, he had another scheme in hand to secure his illgotten throne. He is said to have declared his nephew, John de la Pole, earl of Lincoln, his heir; but such a successor was ill suited to his views. He was childless, and his queen, Anne Nevile, was not likely to bear him another son. To work out his scheme of ambition, therefore, he must marry again; and his second wife must be that "Elizabeth Grey," to whom Richmond was to be united if he could win the crown of England. The lady Elizabeth was kept constantly about the person of the queen, and indulged in all the pleasures of the court. It was remarked that she was, during the festivities of the Christmas of this year, which were kept at Westminster with great splendour, dressed in robes of the same fashion and colour as those of the queen. But while Anne Nevile was living, Richard could have no hope of marrying Elizabeth. In the month of February, 1485, however, Queen Anne very conveniently fell sick. It seems to have been calculated that she would die, and to have been settled between Richard and the queen-dowager and her daughter, that at her death the Red and the White Rose should be united by the marriage of the expectant widower and his niece. That this most strange and unnatural union was contemplated seems certain, for Elizabeth, the mother, while Queen Anne was sick, wrote to her son, the marquis of Dorset, commanding him to retire from Richmond's cause immediately; while Elizabeth, the daughter, implored Howard, duke of Norfolk, by letter, to employ his good offices in forwarding her marriage with "her joy and maker in this world, the master of her thoughts and heart," King Richard. It is even related that she expressed her surprise that the queen was so long in dying, that February was nearly past and yet she was still alive! Was the poison too slow in working its fatal effects? or was Anne's constitution battling with natural disease? Whichever it was, the end at length came. Anne died in March, and then Elizabeth expected to ascend the throne. But it would not do after all for Richard to marry Elizabeth. He was told by those around him that he was suspected of poisoning his queen, and, by marrying Elizabeth, that suspicion would be confirmed; and that his friends, even those of the north, would assuredly forsake his cause. Their attachment had chiefly arisen out of their affection for the daughter of the great earl of Warwick, and if such a union took place, that affection would be severed from his throne. Besides it was urged, and rightly so, that his marriage with his niece would be incestuous; and that if he obtained a dispensation from the Pope, for which he seems to have applied, it would not be sufficient to screen him from the popular indignation. Upon these representations, Richard gave up all thoughts of making Elizabeth queen of England. As it was, Richard felt that the very rumour of such a marriage was injurious to him; and on the 11th of April, in the great hall of the Temple, he solemnly declared before the mayor and citizens of London, that he had never entertained such a project. He also wrote a letter to the citizens of York, relating how he had explained matters to the citizens of London, and requesting them to seize all persons who promulgated such a report, and send them before the council. There can scarcely be a doubt that Richard did contemplate such a marriage, but finding that the nation was averse to its consummation, it was his policy to deny it; and by way of proving that his denial was founded in truth, to send Elizabeth to Sheriff Hutton Castle, where her cousin, the earl of Warwick, the son of the duke of Clarence, was kept in honourable captivity.

But all King Richard could do failed to appease the angry feelings which the people now generally entertained toward him. His crimes were so many and so shocking to humanity, that every one of probity and honour were desirous that the sceptre should be wrested from his hands. It was while the people were thus widely disaffected, that Richmond was collecting ships and troops at Harfleur a second time to invade England. He had been honourably entertained at the court of France: that court looking upon Richard as a usurper. Richard had desired to live in friendship with Louis XI., but that monarch looked upon him as inhuman and cruel, and would neither answer his letters nor receive his ambassadors. His son and successor, Charles VIII., entertained similar sentiments, and he not only received Richmond with kindness, but supplied him with money and about three thousand Normans to aid him in his intended enterprise. Richard was well aware of the preparations that were being made, and he spared no efforts to avert the danger. With the view of exciting the prejudices of the people against his rival, he issued a proclamation in which he called him "One Henry Tudor," who was "descended of bastard blood both by father and mother's side, and who, therefore, could have no claim to the crown of England." In that

proclamation he also represented that in case of success he had covenanted with the king of France to resign all pretensions of right to Normandy, Anjou, Maine, Guienne, and even that brightest jewel in the English crown, Calais. The arms of France and England were to be for ever dissevered. The kingdom of England itself was to be laid under the feet of traitors and foreigners. They were to have as rewards for their services all the dignities and wealth of the Church; all duchies, earldoms, baronies, and other inheritances of knights, squires, and other gentlemen. His was to be a conquest, if made, attended with as complete a change as that which was effected by William the Conqueror. Like the redoubtable Norman, Richmond was coming with bands of robbers and murderers. Rebels were coming with him: men who were attainted by the high court of parliament; many of whom it was well known were cut-throats, adulterers, and extortioners. If, therefore, they loved their wives and children—if they wished to keep possession of their goods and hereditaments, Richard called upon them as good Englishmen to resist the bastard invader. For himself, if they would stand in their own defence, he promised them, as a diligent and courageous prince, to put his own royal person in the utmost peril on *their* behalf. But all this fell upon the ears of the people as an idle tale. There was not the slightest sign of patriotism among them. Their king was active, they were apathetic; nay, their feelings were engaged on the side of the invader. He employed spies abroad, and stationed men and horses on all the principal roads of England to bring him news of any landing or commotion in the country, and he fitted out a fleet to guard the seas; but it was all to very little purpose—the heart of the nation was disaffected. Still he affected to feel secure in the loyalty of his people. He was told while he was celebrating the festival of the Epiphany, when he was attired in his royal robes and wearing the crown on his head, that Richmond would certainly invade his kingdom in the course of the spring or summer, and he rejoiced to hear it, he would then have an opportunity of crushing his enemies. But he soon found that he had not the means he required to raise an army with which he could hope to meet his enemies with success. Loyal as he pretended to believe his people were, they would not fight without pay, and his exchequer was low. His one parliament had granted him the duties of tonnage and poundage for life, but he had only received those duties for one year, and that was not sufficient for his purpose. What could he do? In the present state of affairs he could not call another parliament to aid him; and so he did that which destroyed the last remnant of his popularity among the citizens of London. In direct opposition to his own and his parliament's ordinance, namely, that the "benevolences," or rather the extortions of the late reign, should never be renewed, he exacted forced loans—a measure which was as imprudent as it was illegal; especially as those employed to demand those "benevolences," or as the Londoners called them "*mal*evolences," acted in a tyrannical manner.

At length, on the 7th of August, the invader came. Richmond landed at Milford Haven. He had with him about five thousand men, of whom not one half were English. Richard was at Nottingham when he heard the news; and he issued proclamations to all his subjects to join his standard, denouncing destruction on all who did not obey. He was joined at Leicester by the duke of Norfolk, Lord Lovel, and Brackenbury, who brought levies from the eastern counties, from Hampshire, and London. But many lords and sheriffs of counties who had been summoned dared to disobey. His friend, Lord Stanley, constable of England, was among the missing. He had obtained permission to go into the country to raise his followers, and as Richard had begun to suspect his fidelity, he had left his eldest son, the Lord Strange, as a hostage, but still he did not appear. He was ill in bed, he sent word, with the sweating sickness, and, therefore, begged a short delay; when he recovered he would come. It seems probable that Henry knew Richmond had by this time marched undisturbed through Wales, and the whole country where the influence of the Stanleys was all potent. Alarmed at this, he kept watch upon his hostage the Lord Strange. He attempted to escape, but he was brought back; and when he was interrogated, he confessed that the Stanleys were in favour of the invader, but in order to save his life he assured Richard that his father was still faithful to his cause, and that he would soon join him. He would write to him, he said, to hasten his coming: but all the while he knew that his father's followers in Cheshire and Lancashire, though nominally raised for the services of Richard, would fight for Richmond, and that Lord Stanley, who proved deceitful to the last, would lead them on to battle.

As soon as Richmond had landed, messengers were sent to his friends in all quarters to come to his assistance. Without waiting for them at Milford Haven, however, he marched forward. As he passed through Wales several Welsh gentlemen, with their friends, joined him. Among these was Sir Rice ap Thomas, who, with Sir Walter Herbert, had raised and commanded a considerable body of men to obstruct his progress. Sir Walter himself was faithful to Richard, but disheartened by his colleague's desertion, he suffered Richmond to pass through Wales without opposition. This time, the Severn afforded no obstacle to the march of an army. It was crossed, and Richmond had no sooner passed that river, than he was joined by Sir George Talbot at the head of two thousand men, the vassals of his nephew, the young earl of Shrewsbury. Other families, also, ranged themselves under his standard. But his army, as compared with that of his rival, was very inferior in numbers and discipline. Still he pressed forward, for he knew that Richard could not depend upon his forces. At Stafford, indeed, he was met by Sir William Stanley, the brother of Lord Stanley, who had raised two thousand men for Richard, and at their interview the future movements of Sir William and his brother were so arranged as to make Richard believe they intended to join him, and at the same time to have it in their power to join Richmond when they could do him the most effectual service. In accordance with their arrangement, Lord Stanley, who was at Lichfield with three thousand men, at the approach of Richmond retired to Atherstone. Thither, also, came

Richmond, and while he was in that town swarms of deserters came over to him from the enemy. He reached Atherstone on the 22nd of August, and on the same day Richard marched out of Leicester with the crown on his head and encamped near the town of Bosworth. He had fifteen thousand men under his command, and if he had been joined by the Stanleys as he expected, and his troops had all been faithful to his cause, Richmond and his adherents must have been crushed.

It was on Monday, the 23rd of August, that the rivals met in battle. On the morning of that day Richard, still wearing his crown, of which—stained with blood as it was—he was so proud, mounted his war-horse, marshalled his troops and advanced. At the same time Henry moved from Atherstone. The two armies met in the midst of an open plain nearly surrounded by hills, which commences about a mile south of Bosworth. "There," says Fabyan, "was fought a sharp battle, and sharper should it have been if the king's party had been fast to him, but many towards the field refused him, and rode over to the other party, and some stood hovering afar off, till they saw to which side the victory would fall." The Stanleys took their position on the wings of Richard's army, watching their opportunity to strike for Richmond. The battle was begun with the archers; but the combatants soon drew closer together. But Richard's troops did not fight as if they were in earnest, and the earl of Northumberland, with his hardy men of the north, did not strike one stroke. In truth, of all the lords who followed him scarcely one proved faithful, except the duke of Norfolk and his son the earl of Surrey. Norfolk led the van, and fell upon the advanced guard of the enemy, which was under the command of the brave Lord Oxford, the escaped prisoner from Ham, and his attack made some impression on Oxford's ranks. But his single efforts were vain. At this time Lord Stanley had attacked the flank of Richard's army, while whole bands of his troops were leaving their positions, either to fall back into the rear or to go over to his rival. As he saw his lines wavering and broken by desertion, and as he saw the Lord Stanley fighting against him, he put spurs to his horse, and shouting treason, galloped into the midst of the enemy. Hope had fled, and he became desperate. As he rushed into the midst of Richmond's troops he caught sight of his rival, and he resolved to put an end to the contest either by his own death or that of his competitor. With sword in hand, he cut his way through every obstacle, till he reached Henry's standard. Sir John Cheyne was unhorsed by him, and Sir William Brandon, the standard bearer, slain. He was about to make a deadly thrust at his rival, when those around closed upon him, and throwing him from his horse, despatched him with many wounds. Lord Stanley was in at his death, and picking up his crown, he put it on the head of Richmond. He perished in the thirty-fifth year of his age; having reigned two years and about two months.

Historians differ as to the numbers that fell slain in this decisive battle—the most probable account being one thousand on the side of the vanquished, and but few on that of the victors. Among those who shared the fate of their master were the duke of Norfolk, the lord Ferrers, Sir Richard Ratcliffe, and Sir Robert Brackenbury. Sir William Catesby, and some few others, were captured, and afterwards beheaded; but as Henry's politic anxiety was to reconcile all parties, to terminate the deadly war of the Roses, he displayed great clemency towards those who had fought against him. He had won the crown, for he was hailed king of England on the field of battle, and the nation endorsed his title, and it was his wisdom to make friends of his foes. When the soldiers had done shouting, "Long live King Henry!" the body of Richard was picked up, stripped, tied across a horse behind a pursuivant-at-arms, and carried to Leicester; where, after being exposed to the public for a few days, it was buried, *sans ceremonie*, in the church of the Grey Friars.

Historians have very generally represented King Richard as a monster both in mind and body. Rous of Warwick, who was his contemporary, describes him as a tyrant, and in order to make good his title to that unenviable character, he says that "having remained two years in his mother's womb, he came into the world with teeth and long hair down to his shoulders." If this was truth, he was a perfect ogre from the date of his birth. But Master Rous must have taken his dictum from some slanderous detractor. He could never have seen him, for that he was such a monster is disproved by the fact that he was a sort of Adonis. Anne Nevile, his wife, loved him; Elizabeth Grey called him "her joy and maker in this world, the master of her heart and thoughts." Ladies are not apt to love or to fall in love with monsters. The truth is that King Richard was small of stature, had a sharp visage and unequal shoulders—his right shoulder being a little higher than the left, to which no lady could have a particular objection. The chief deformity of Richard III. consisted in his mind, not in his body; and we wonder that any historian, ancient or modern, should adduce his personal appearance to blacken his character.

"The mind's the standard of the man;"

and by that alone can posterity, if the man is of such an exalted position as to command its attention, be judged. His being a giant or a dwarf is a matter of no moment. Even Master Rous seems to have so considered; for after describing him as a monster, he says, "If I may venture to say anything to his honour, though he was a little man, he was a noble and valiant soldier." No one ever denied his personal courage. He is also said to have been much admired for his eloquence and his powers of persuasion: especially, it is added, when they were aided by his bounty, which was sometimes excessive. There is nothing more eloquent than gold; it thrills the hearts of recipients with pleasing emotions, and for a time at least makes friends of foes. In all this there is nothing detrimental to the character of King Richard. It is rather in his political conduct that we find him to have assumed the shape of a monster. Ambition was his ruling passion. It was this evil principle that led him to commit the many crimes his history unfolds: this that warped his mind to such a degree that when once he had formed a design, he hesitated not to carry

it out by murder, not excepting the lives even of his own family. He sprinkled his pathway to the throne with blood, shed more to sustain it; and, by a just retribution, by the shedding of his own blood, he lost his crown: a fate, Hume thinks, "too mild and honourable for his multiplied and detestable enormities."

At this point of our national history, the affairs of Scotland again demand brief attention, in order to make the general narrative intelligible to the reader. When Henry IV., king of England, ascended the throne, Robert III., the great-grandson of Bruce, had been seated on that of Scotland about nine years. Robert was a man of great amiability of nature, and, although somewhat given to superstition, of genuine piety. He was fifty years of age before he became king; but he was ill fitted to govern a kingdom such as Scotland was at that rude period. During his father's lifetime his younger brothers, the earls of Fife and Buchan, had been intrusted with the affairs of government, and when he became king he affected a retired life; the earl of Fife, who was afterwards created duke of Albany, was allowed to continue, under the title of Custos or Guardian, ruler of the kingdom. His own son David, prince of Scotland and duke of Rothesay, was then too young to act as his father's "Custos;" but when he had grown up to manhood, aided by a strong party of the nobility in the year 1398, he compelled the duke of Albany to resign that post to him. But David, although of a temper the very opposite to that of his father, was equally ill fitted to rule the kingdom. His profligacy brought ruin on himself, and many calamities on his country. In the year 1400, he was contracted to a daughter of the earl of March, and some part of her dower was paid; but when the rich and powerful earl of Douglas represented to him that the contract was illegal, as the nobility had not been consulted, and offered him his own daughter Marjory, with a larger fortune, the lady Elizabeth Dunbar was unceremoniously set aside, and David married Marjory in the castle of Bothwell. But matrimony made no reformation in the manners of David, duke of Rothesay. Neglecting his wife, Marjory, and the affairs of the kingdom, he abandoned himself to the pursuit of his licentious pleasures. His reckless career raised up against him many powerful enemies, and his father Robert was induced, in the year 1402, to give an order under the royal signet, to arrest him and place him under temporary confinement. It seems probable that it was chiefly at Albany's suggestion that this order was given, for he was a man of craft, and was ambitious of regaining his position as regent. Albany willingly executed the king's mandate. David was apprehended as he was on his way to the town of St. Andrew's; and after being kept a few days in the castle there, was transferred to a dungeon in Falkland palace, where he died—the general belief being that he was starved to death. The duke of Albany now again became regent. The assumption of his regency was followed by operations against England. Enraged at the breach of contract between Prince David and his daughter, the earl of March retired into England and entered into a negotiation with Henry IV., which terminated in his swearing fealty to that prince. Henry gave him and his heirs the lordship of Somerton in Lincolnshire, and the manor of Clipston for his life. So embittered was the earl of March against his country, that he aided the English in making incursions into Scotland, which induced Albany to resume hostile operations against England. Two Scottish armies were successively marched across the borders, but they were both signally defeated—the one at Nesbit Moor, and the other at Hamildon Hill, as before recorded.

By a solemn act under the great seal passed in a parliament held at Edinburgh in May, 1402, it was declared that Prince David "had died by Divine Providence, and not otherwise;" that the king and parliament approved of his imprisonment as necessary for the public good; and that if King Robert had entertained any ill will against his brother Albany and his agents, on account of his son's death, he now laid it aside, and held them to be loyal subjects. But notwithstanding this solemn act it is evident that Robert had his suspicions of his brother's designs. It was at this time he resolved to send his youngest son, Prince James, to France, not merely to receive an education suitable to his rank and the station he was designed to fill, but that he might be out of the reach of danger. At this time, A.D. 1405, there was a truce between England and Scotland; but as the vessel in which the young prince and his attendants sailed was off Flamborough Head, it was seized by the English, and he was carried prisoner to London. Some historians have asserted that the news of his son's captivity broke the heart of the old king; but there is evidence that he survived this blow to his hopes for more than a year, for he died at his castle of Rothesay, in Bute, in April, A.D. 1406.

At the death of Robert III. a parliament was held at Perth, which after declaring James, the prisoner of Henry IV., lawful king, continued his uncle, Albany, in the regency. Besides the king, Archibald, earl of Douglas, Murdoch, earl of Fife, the regent's eldest son, and other Scottish nobles, with many knights, were prisoners in England; having been taken in the recent battles of Nesbit Moor, Hamildon Hill, and Shrewsbury. For several years there was peace between the two countries, during which time the duke of Albany made strenuous efforts to obtain the release of all the captives in England—except King James. His own son, Murdoch, was set at liberty by Henry V., A.D. 1416: he being exchanged for Henry Percy, son of the famous Hotspur. Albany stands accused of using all his influence to prevent the liberation of the young king; and although there is no historical evidence of the fact, his love of power goes far to support the accusation. In every respect he acted as king. Thus, in the year 1409, by his own authority, without consulting the king or his parliament, he restored the earl of March, who wished to return to his native land, to his honours, and the greater part of his forfeited estate. That he considered himself king is clear from a letter written by him, A.D. 1410, to the English monarch; for in that letter he styled himself regent of Scotland, by the grace of God, and called the people of Scotland "his subjects." From his making no efforts to obtain the release of King James, it is supposed that Albany, under an apprehension that if the peace between the

two countries continued much longer he should not be able to ward off his return, in September, A.D. 1417, suddenly broke the truce by investing Berwick and Roxburgh. Such an act would be likely to prolong the captivity of the young king, as it would incense the English monarch against the Scottish nation. On this occasion Albany had an army of sixty thousand men, and the expedition is known in history as the "Foul Raid;" but its results were more fatal to Scotland than England; for on the approach of the dukes of Bedford and Exeter, at the head of a formidable army, the Scots retired, and then the English entered the south of Scotland, and laid it waste.

It seems probable that this "Foul Raid" may have been undertaken at the instigation of the French court. At this time there was war between France and England, and as the French court maintained a close alliance with the regent, Albany, such an expedition might have been suggested for the purpose of a diversion, as well as to prolong the captivity of King James. But though the Scots did not give Henry V. much disquiet in England, they were a thorn in his side on the continent. Very shortly after the "Foul Raid," an embassy was sent from the dauphin of France to the regent of Scotland, to implore assistance; and as the regent and estates conceived that if France and England should become united under one crown, Scotland could not long preserve its independence, the earl of Buchan, Albany's second son, and the earl of Wigton, were sent with seven thousand of the choicest warriors of Scotland to fight against the English. These troops, with others that followed them, under the earl of Douglas, fought bravely in many a bloody field, until in the battles of Crovant and Verneuil they were almost annihilated.

Robert, duke of Albany, did not live to hear of the deeds of valour performed by his son, the earl of Buchan, and his countrymen. He died at his palace at Stirling, A.D. 1420, in the eightieth year of his age. He was succeeded in the regency by his son, Murdoch, earl of Fife. Murdoch, also, succeeded to his father's estates and honours. But Murdoch was a different character to that of the old duke. He had neither his capacity nor his ambition. His father had been able not only to control the feudal nobility of Scotland, but to attach them to his interest. He might be regarded as their chief or leader; raised up and supported by them against both the crown and the people. Murdoch, duke of Albany, possessed no such power over the Scottish nobles. He could not even control the turbulent spirits of his own three sons, much more the refractory nobles. The country soon fell into a state of anarchy; and it is said that, fatigued by the affairs of government, he earnestly desired the deliverance of James from his captivity. But at this time, A.D. 1423, the king of Scotland could scarcely be called a captive. He had accompanied Henry V. in his war with France, and lived in friendship with him. Hence, when commissioners arrived at the court of Henry to negotiate for his liberation, the matter was soon settled. An agreement was concluded at York on the 10th of September, by which he was to be released on these easy terms; namely, that forty thousand pounds should be paid to England within six years, in half-yearly payments; which sum was to be considered as a compensation for the expenses of his maintenance during the eighteen years of his captivity. But James did not return to Scotland till after there had been a wedding. Tradition makes him to have fallen in love some years before with the lady Joanna Beaufort, as he watched her from his prison in the Round Tower of Windsor Castle. The lady Joanna was a near relation of King Henry, being the daughter of the duchess of Clarence by her first husband, the duke of Somerset, who was the son of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. James was married to the lady Joanna, at St. Mary Overy, in Southwark, on the 24th of February, A.D. 1424, and he with his queen arrived in Scotland on the 5th of April. They were crowned in the abbey church of Scone on the 21st of May: Murdoch, duke of Albany, having the honour, as earl of Fife—and therefore entitled to that honour—of placing him on the throne.

On ascending that throne, James had much difficult work to perform. His kingdom had, by the two regents, been brought into a state which demanded his utmost sagacity to remedy. Brought up, however, in the school of adversity—a school of the greatest value to subjects and monarchs if they rightly use its teachings and discipline—he was fitted for the work he had in hand. That work was principally to overthrow the domination of the feudal nobility, and to restore order and good government. There was universal violence and rapine prevailing in his kingdom; but he resolved, on ascertaining the evil, to grapple with it by no half measures. It is said that he observed, "Let but God grant me life, and by his help I shall make the key keep the castle, and the furze-bush the cow throughout my dominions, though I should lead the life of a dog to complete it." There had been a truce concluded with England for seven years, and thus he had time granted for his work of reform. Nor did he waste that time. Five days after his coronation only had elapsed, when he met his parliament at Perth. There was a review of the manifold disorders of the country entered into by this parliament, and measures were adopted for their correction, but the root of these disorders lay too deep to be corrected by legislative enactments. The reins of government had been so much relaxed by the regents—especially by Duke Murdoch—that but little attention was paid to the proceedings of this parliament. There was a tax levied, of no great amount, for the payment of the debt to England; but though the Scots had got their king back again, they were not in a disposition to pay it willingly. It was decidedly unpopular, and James was compelled to desist from that mode of raising money; although against his will he was compelled to detain the hostages in England—for hostages had been left there as a pledge of his good faith—longer than he intended or desired. The opposition he met with at the outset appears to have emanated chiefly from the late regent, and his family, and partisans. They were, at all events, considered by him to be the obstacles in his work of reform. To rid himself of these, therefore, was his next object. He had caused Walter, the eldest son of the late regent, Murdoch, to be arrested and imprisoned before the meeting of his parliament at

it out by murder, not excepting the lives even of his own family. He sprinkled his pathway to the throne with blood, shed more to sustain it; and, by a just retribution, by the shedding of his own blood, he lost his crown: a fate, Hume thinks, "too mild and honourable for his multiplied and detestable enormities."

At this point of our national history, the affairs of Scotland again demand brief attention, in order to make the general narrative intelligible to the reader. When Henry IV., king of England, ascended the throne, Robert III., the great-grandson of Bruce, had been seated on that of Scotland about nine ye
Robert was a man of great amiability of nature
although somewhat given to superstition, of
piety. He was fifty years of age before
king; but he was ill fitted to govern a
as Scotland was at that rude perio
father's lifetime his younger brother
and Buchan, had been intrusted
government, and when he bec
retired life; the earl of F
created duke of Albany, w
the title of Custos or G
His own son David
Rothesay, was the
"Custos;" but
aided by a st
1398, he cr
post to
very c
fitte
ru
J

of the southern
northern Highlands,
his parliament enacted at
summoned every year to
kingdom by legislative
entirely set at nought,
observed. Feeling that it was
example of some of the turbu-
in that region, James called a parliament
That parliament appears to have been
and all the chieftains in the neigh-
were invited to attend. Some of
lent kept aloof for a time; but when
that those who had readily accepted the
were most royally entertained, and nothing
about the disorders which had reigned in
parts, they no longer hesitated. *They* came,
to partake of the royal entertainments, and to
their seats in parliament, but as it happened at
so it happened at Inverness. About fifty of
heads of clans were suddenly arrested. Three of
most noted leaders of bands of plunderers were
to death; others were imprisoned; while some of
least guilty were dismissed with a caution to be
more obedient for the future. Among those who were made prisoners at this time, and subsequently set at liberty, was Alexander, lord of the Isles: one of the most potent chiefs of the north. On him the admonition and clemency of James had no effect. In the year 1429 Alexander collected his followers, and openly revolted against the royal authority; but he was defeated by James in a battle fought near Lochaber, and soon after threw himself on the royal mercy. Unwarned by his fate, Donald Balloch, a near relation of the lord of the Isles, in the year 1431 rebelled; but after desolating some part of the country with fire and sword, at the approach of his king with his army, he was abandoned by his followers, and the pacification of the highlands is said to have been completed by the execution of three hundred "captured thieves and robbers." Donald fled to Ireland, where he was soon killed, and his head was sent to the king.

There was now for a time peace both in the south

his heirs th lordship of
and the mar r of Clif
was the ear l of M
aided the E lis
which indu
against En
sively ma
signall
other

James seemed esta-
him, for at this period
d with England for five
maintained a close alliance;
this time contracted betwen
eldest daughter, Margaret, both
n their infancy. This was in the
was stipulated in the treaty that
be sent into France at once, with an
sand men as her dower, to fight for
who was then reduced to great distress
ss of the English arms. But if this part
aty was not wholly set aside, its execution
yed by the diplomacy of Henry Beaufort,
l of Winchester, and uncle to the queen of
and, who, in a personal interview with James, at
rham, prevailed upon him to keep the truce with
England, and neither to send his daughter nor the succours into France for the present. It was fortunate for James that he listened to this wise counsel; for it was immediately after that he was called upon to quell the rebellion of Alexander, lord of the Isles, and of Donald Balloch.

Had James now exercised the virtue of prudence, he might probably have succeeded in consolidating the reforms he had commenced, and established the authority of the laws. For several years there was a considerable degree of peace and prosperity in his kingdom. But one part of his scheme for breaking down the strength of the nobility, which, in the year 1435, he began to unfold, was fatal to its success. The crown of Scotland had been greatly impoverished and weakened by the regents in their lavish distribution of the royal domains among the Scottish aristocracy. The regents had no right to give these domains away; but having obtained them, the Scottish nobles were not men to resign them back to the crown without opposition. Yet James dared to provoke that opposition. He had annexed the estates of the family of Albany to his crown; but he now began to lay claim to some others. Among these were the estates of George Dunbar, earl of March, which had been forfeited by his father, but had been restored by Robert, duke of Albany, and held in repossession for more than twenty years. A committee was appointed by a parliament which met at Perth in January to examine into this matter, and after hearing the evidence on both sides, that committee laid an opinion before parliament, on which this sentence was pronounced:—"That in consequence of the forfeiture of George Dunbar, late earl of March, the earldom of March belonged to the king." About the same time, James resumed the earldom of Strathearn, and although he made some amends to the earl who then held it, Malice Graham, of the family of Kincardine, by granting him the earldom of Monteith, that family was incensed at the act, and Robert Graham, the uncle of the deprived earl, especially meditated revenge. Indeed, this resumption of the crown lands by James caused a widespread disaffection, and gave rise to a conspiracy which proved fatal to his life. Several of those who were thus deprived of their estates, who were among the most eminent of the nobility, had held them, and their predecessors before them, for many years; and although James may have

...v on his side in resuming them, it is scarcely ...ondered at that in so doing, he created for ...any enemies.

...foreign policy which James at this period ...those enemies great advantage over him. ...ar 1435, he sent his daughter, Margaret, ...be betrothed to the dauphin. The ...ent had endeavoured to prevent this ...croope into Scotland, to negotiate a ...twcen the two countries, to be ...riage of the English king with ...igh Scroope made the most ...g up Berwick and Roxburgh, ...pute between England and ...rejected; and the dauphin ...d to the young princess ...tural consequence, at the ...ne 1st of May, A.D. 1436, ...nglish proposals produced ...a the two nations. James marched ...ne border, and laid siege to the castle of ...gh. It is difficult to understand why he ...ould, at such a juncture, have so far departed from his uniform pacific policy, as not only to provoke but commence war with England, unless he considered that by so doing he should give employment to the fierce spirits he had so recently irritated, with a view of allaying that irritation. If that was his motive he was deceived. The offence given was too deep to be forgotten even by a war with England, which was at all times popular with the Scottish nobles. James pushed the siege of Roxburgh with great vigour, and the garrison was about to surrender, when his queen suddenly arrived in his camp, and informed him that there was a plot against his life. She knew of no particulars, but was well assured of the fact. Knowing that many of his barons were disaffected, and fearing that the conspirators might be in his own camp, James immediately raised the siege and retired to the north. He finally took up his residence in the Carthusian monastery at Perth, which he had recently founded, where he spent his Christmas. It would appear that the suspicions which had been awakened in his breast were at this time lulled, for he was surrounded by a numerous and brilliant court. It was in that court and not in his camp that his enemies were, and the chief of them were so nearly connected with him by the ties of blood that they were not suspected. At their head was Walter, earl of Athole, his uncle; and connected with him were his grandson, Sir Robert Stewart, chamberlain in the royal household, and that man of furious passions, Sir Robert Graham. It would appear that it was the intention of the conspirators to proclaim Robert Stewart king, as being the descendant of Robert II., and who was held by them to be the rightful heir, as it was alleged Robert III. was born out of wedlock. All these had been adherents of Albany, and had wrongs to revenge of recent date. Graham undertook the bloody office of avenger, for which, from his determined character, he was well fitted. The court had spent a merry Christmas, and had prolonged the revels of the festive season far into the new year before the blow was struck. After dark, on the night of the 20th of February, A.D. 1437, Graham, with seven of his accomplices, stole into Perth, and were secretly admitted into the monastery of the Black Friars by Robert Stewart, the chamberlain. The story of what followed is differently told. One account is, that as his assassins proceeded towards the royal chamber where James was standing in his night-dress, conversing with the queen and the ladies before he retired to rest, he heard them approach with noise and tumult; that then he flew to the windows, which he found so barred as to prevent egress; that then he rushed to the door, when he found the bolts had been removed; that then he took up, in a frenzy of despair, one of the planks of the floor, which he replaced, and dropped into a dark vault below; that then an heroic woman, named Caroline Douglas, made her arm a bolt for the door of the bed-chamber, till the bone of that fragile arm was snapped in two; and that then the conspirators rushed in, and, after a long search after James, discovered his place of concealment, and dropping into the vault below, despatched him with many wounds—the sword of Graham giving him the death-stroke. All this savours, as the reader may easily perceive, of romance. It would rather appear that James was assassinated in his private apartment, where he was sitting at supper with the queen and a few attendants: that his cup-bearer had given the alarm which cost his life, and that Queen Margaret herself was wounded in endeavouring, as a loving wife would do, to save her consort from death. James perished in the forty-fourth year of his age, and, dating from his coronation, in the thirteenth of his reign. He left issue one son, and five daughters.

By his rigid rule he had made himself unpopular among his subjects; but when they heard of his death in such a manner, it is said their complaints were hushed, and there was nothing but lamentation and mourning for his loss. Their affection, it is added, was displayed by the ardour with which they pursued his murderers and brought them to justice; as well as by the ingenious and horrid tortures which they were made to endure when they were put to death for their crime. It is said that the two chief conspirators, the earl of Athole and Graham, for three whole days had every complicated refinement of torture applied to them to prolong their dying agonies; Graham glorying in his crime to the last.

The murdered king was succeeded on his throne, not by Robert Stewart, but by his own son James, then an infant of six years of age. James II. was crowned on the 20th of March, in the abbey of Holyrood House. A parliament was then sitting at Edinburgh, and Archibald, earl of Douglas, was appointed lieutenant of the kingdom during the king's minority. Douglas, however, did not long enjoy his power, for soon after he had been mainly instrumental in concluding a truce with England—which was concluded in London on the 31st of March, A.D. 1438—he died. Soon after his death Scotland fell into the utmost confusion. The records of this state of things are very perplexing, but it would appear that they arose from the arrogance of William, earl of Douglas, son of Archibald, and from the discord that existed between the governor of Edinburgh Castle, Sir Alexander Livingstone, and the chancellor, Sir William Crichton; both of whom are represented

Perth. On what grounds he was arrested is not stated; but considering that his own father had not been able to check his turbulence, it may be presumed that his arrest was for the same cause. But this warning was unheeded. There was wide-spread disaffection against the restraining government of King James. Hence he proceeded still further. On the 12th of March, A.D. 1425, another parliament was assembled at Perth, and on the ninth day of its sitting, Murdoch, duke of Albany, himself, with his youngest son, Alexander, and twenty-four of their partisans, all barons of high estate, were arrested. With the exception of the duke, his two sons, and his father-in-law, the earl of Lennox, all these prisoners were soon set at liberty; but *they* were conducted to Stirling, tried by their peers with great solemnity, condemned, and beheaded: their large estates being forfeited to the crown. The youngest son of Murdoch made his escape, and with a band of desperate followers burnt the town of Dumbarton, and killed John Stewart of Dundonald, the king's natural uncle, and then fled into Ireland, where he died.

By this severity the turbulence of the southern nobles was repressed. In the northern Highlands, the laws which James and his parliament enacted at Perth—which was usually summoned every year to remedy the disorders of the kingdom by legislative enactments—were either still entirely set at nought, or but imperfectly obeyed. Feeling that it was necessary to make an example of some of the turbulent chiefs in that region, James called a parliament at Inverness. That parliament appears to have been held in the castle, and all the chieftains in the neighbouring counties were invited to attend. Some of the most turbulent kept aloof for a time; but when they found that those who had readily accepted the invitation were most royally entertained, and nothing was said about the disorders which had reigned in those parts, they no longer hesitated. *They* came, also, to partake of the royal entertainments, and to take their seats in parliament, but as it happened at Perth, so it happened at Inverness. About fifty of the heads of clans were suddenly arrested. Three of the most noted leaders of bands of plunderers were put to death; others were imprisoned; while some of the least guilty were dismissed with a caution to be more obedient for the future. Among those who were made prisoners at this time, and subsequently set at liberty, was Alexander, lord of the Isles: one of the most potent chiefs of the north. On him the admonition and clemency of James had no effect. In the year 1429 Alexander collected his followers, and openly revolted against the royal authority; but he was defeated by James in a battle fought near Lochaber, and soon after threw himself on the royal mercy. Unwarned by his fate, Donald Balloch, a near relation of the lord of the Isles, in the year 1431 rebelled; but after desolating some part of the country with fire and sword, at the approach of his king with his army, he was abandoned by his followers, and the pacification of the highlands is said to have been completed by the execution of three hundred "captured thieves and robbers." Donald fled to Ireland, where he was soon killed, and his head was sent to the king.

There was now for a time peace both in the south and the north. The throne of James seemed established. No foes disturbed him, for at this period the truce had been renewed with England for five years. With France he maintained a close alliance; and a marriage was at this time contracted between the dauphin and his eldest daughter, Margaret, both of whom were still in their infancy. This was in the year 1428; and it was stipulated in the treaty that Margaret should be sent into France at once, with an army of six thousand men as her dower, to fight for Charles VII., who was then reduced to great distress by the success of the English arms. But if this part of the treaty was not wholly set aside, its execution was delayed by the diplomacy of Henry Beaufort, cardinal of Winchester, and uncle to the queen of Scotland, who, in a personal interview with James, at Durham, prevailed upon him to keep the truce with England, and neither to send his daughter nor the succours into France for the present. It was fortunate for James that he listened to this wise counsel; for it was immediately after that he was called upon to quell the rebellion of Alexander, lord of the Isles, and of Donald Balloch.

Had James now exercised the virtue of prudence, he might probably have succeeded in consolidating the reforms he had commenced, and established the authority of the laws. For several years there was a considerable degree of peace and prosperity in his kingdom. But one part of his scheme for breaking down the strength of the nobility, which, in the year 1435, he began to unfold, was fatal to its success. The crown of Scotland had been greatly impoverished and weakened by the regents in their lavish distribution of the royal domains among the Scottish aristocracy. The regents had no right to give these domains away; but having obtained them, the Scottish nobles were not men to resign them back to the crown without opposition. Yet James dared to provoke that opposition. He had annexed the estates of the family of Albany to his crown; but he now began to lay claim to some others. Among these were the estates of George Dunbar, earl of March, which had been forfeited by his father, but had been restored by Robert, duke of Albany, and held in repossession for more than twenty years. A committee was appointed by a parliament which met at Perth in January to examine into this matter, and after hearing the evidence on both sides, that committee laid an opinion before parliament, on which this sentence was pronounced:—"That in consequence of the forfeiture of George Dunbar, late earl of March, the earldom of March belonged to the king." About the same time, James resumed the earldom of Strathearn, and although he made some amends to the earl who then held it, Malice Graham, of the family of Kincardine, by granting him the earldom of Monteith, that family was incensed at the act, and Robert Graham, the uncle of the deprived earl, especially meditated revenge. Indeed, this resumption of the crown lands by James caused a widespread disaffection, and gave rise to a conspiracy which proved fatal to his life. Several of those who were thus deprived of their estates, who were among the most eminent of the nobility, had held them, and their predecessors before them, for many years; and although James may have

had law on his side in resuming them, it is scarcely to be wondered at that in so doing, he created for himself many enemies.

And the foreign policy which James at this period adopted gave those enemies great advantage over him. During the year 1435, he sent his daughter, Margaret, to France to be betrothed to the dauphin. The English government had endeavoured to prevent this by sending lord Scroope into Scotland, to negotiate a perpetual peace between the two countries, to be cemented by the marriage of the English king with Margaret; but although Scroope made the most tempting offers of giving up Berwick and Roxburgh, and all the lands in dispute between England and Scotland, those offers were rejected; and the dauphin was preferred as a husband to the young princess before King Henry. As a natural consequence, at the expiration of the truce on the 1st of May, A.D. 1436, the rejection of the English proposals produced hostilities between the two nations. James marched an army to the border, and laid siege to the castle of Roxburgh. It is difficult to understand why he should, at such a juncture, have so far departed from his uniform pacific policy, as not only to provoke but commence war with England, unless he considered that by so doing he should give employment to the fierce spirits he had so recently irritated, with a view of allaying that irritation. If that was his motive he was deceived. The offence given was too deep to be forgotten even by a war with England, which was at all times popular with the Scottish nobles. James pushed the siege of Roxburgh with great vigour, and the garrison was about to surrender, when his queen suddenly arrived in his camp, and informed him that there was a plot against his life. She knew of no particulars, but was well assured of the fact. Knowing that many of his barons were disaffected, and fearing that the conspirators might be in his own camp, James immediately raised the siege and retired to the north. He finally took up his residence in the Carthusian monastery at Perth, which he had recently founded, where he spent his Christmas. It would appear that the suspicions which had been awakened in his breast were at this time lulled, for he was surrounded by a numerous and brilliant court. It was in that court and not in his camp that his enemies were, and the chief of them were so nearly connected with him by the ties of blood that they were not suspected. At their head was Walter, earl of Athole, his uncle; and connected with him were his grandson, Sir Robert Stewart, chamberlain in the royal household, and that man of furious passions, Sir Robert Graham. It would appear that it was the intention of the conspirators to proclaim Robert Stewart king, as being the descendant of Robert II., and who was held by them to be the rightful heir, as it was alleged Robert III. was born out of wedlock. All these had been adherents of Albany, and had wrongs to revenge of recent date. Graham undertook the bloody office of avenger, for which, from his determined character, he was well fitted. The court had spent a merry Christmas, and had prolonged the revels of the festive season far into the new year before the blow was struck. After dark, on the night of the 20th of February, A.D. 1437, Graham, with seven of his accomplices, stole into Perth, and were secretly admitted into the monastery of the Black Friars by Robert Stewart, the chamberlain. The story of what followed is differently told. One account is, that as his assassins proceeded towards the royal chamber where James was standing in his night-dress, conversing with the queen and the ladies before he retired to rest, he heard them approach with noise and tumult; that then he flew to the windows, which he found so barred as to prevent egress; that then he rushed to the door, when he found the bolts had been removed; that then he took up, in a frenzy of despair, one of the planks of the floor, which he replaced, and dropped into a dark vault below; that then an heroic woman, named Caroline Douglas, made her arm a bolt for the door of the bed-chamber, till the bone of that fragile arm was snapped in two; and that then the conspirators rushed in, and, after a long search after James, discovered his place of concealment, and dropping into the vault below, despatched him with many wounds—the sword of Graham giving him the death-stroke. All this savours, as the reader may easily perceive, of romance. It would rather appear that James was assassinated in his private apartment, where he was sitting at supper with the queen and a few attendants: that his cup-bearer had given the alarm which cost his life, and that Queen Margaret herself was wounded in endeavouring, as a loving wife would do, to save her consort from death. James perished in the forty-fourth year of his age, and, dating from his coronation, in the thirteenth of his reign. He left issue one son, and five daughters.

By his rigid rule he had made himself unpopular among his subjects; but when they heard of his death in such a manner, it is said their complaints were hushed, and there was nothing but lamentation and mourning for his loss. Their affection, it is added, was displayed by the ardour with which they pursued his murderers and brought them to justice; as well as by the ingenious and horrid tortures which they were made to endure when they were put to death for their crime. It is said that the two chief conspirators, the earl of Athole and Graham, for three whole days had every complicated refinement of torture applied to them to prolong their dying agonies; Graham glorying in his crime to the last.

The murdered king was succeeded on his throne, not by Robert Stewart, but by his own son James, then an infant of six years of age. James II. was crowned on the 20th of March, in the abbey of Holyrood House. A parliament was then sitting at Edinburgh, and Archibald, earl of Douglas, was appointed lieutenant of the kingdom during the king's minority. Douglas, however, did not long enjoy his power, for soon after he had been mainly instrumental in concluding a truce with England—which was concluded in London on the 31st of March, A.D. 1438—he died. Soon after his death Scotland fell into the utmost confusion. The records of this state of things are very perplexing, but it would appear that they arose from the arrogance of William, earl of Douglas, son of Archibald, and from the discord that existed between the governor of Edinburgh Castle, Sir Alexander Livingstone, and the chancellor, Sir William Crichton; both of whom are represented

as being ambitious of possessing all the power and emoluments of the administration. It would be profitless to enter into a minute detail of the contest between the governor and the chancellor to obtain the possession of the king and the government of the kingdom. On one occasion, it is said that the queen mother, who resided with the governor in Stirling Castle, went to Edinburgh Castle, where her son was with the chancellor, and contrived to carry him away with her in a chest to Stirling; and on another, by a well-conceived plot, as the young king was hunting in the park of Stirling, with a few attendants, the chancellor obtained repossession of his person, and carried him back to Edinburgh. Both the queen and her son were for some time, indeed, constantly prisoners in the hands of one or the other of the rival factions, and no attempts appear to have been made by the young earl of Douglas to check their rivalry. On the contrary, he seems to have let them quarrel on, in the hope that they would destroy one another. Meanwhile, the country became a scene of anarchy and confusion, in which thefts, robberies, and murders were committed with impunity. There was no restraining power in the government. William, earl of Douglas, was himself lawless, for according to Buchan he encouraged his vassals, particularly in Annandale, to plunder those parts of the country that were not under his jurisdiction. He is represented as surrounding himself with ruffians capable of committing any villany. Both Livingstone the governor, and Crichton the chancellor, dreaded his power, and in the year 1440 became reconciled, in order to crush him. It was agreed between them that the king should remain in the hands of Crichton, and that Livingstone should retain all the authority and emoluments of his place. Immediately after this reconciliation, a parliament was called at Edinburgh, to which great numbers of people crowded to complain of the lawless conduct of Douglas and his retainers. It would have been dangerous for parliament to have proceeded with a high hand against that potent earl, but measures were concerted for his destruction. Letters of invitation were sent to him and his friends to come and take their seats in parliament, and to share in the administration of affairs, to which, by their high birth and wealth, they were so well entitled. That invitation was accepted. The earl and his only brother, Lord David, and a splendid retinue, set out for Edinburgh, and on their arrival were warmly welcomed. Every mark of distinction was paid them. They were invited to dine with the king in the castle. Douglas had been warned that he was rushing into danger, but the manner with which he was received disarmed all suspicion. The professions of esteem and friendship lavished on him by Crichton, who met him on his road to Edinburgh, could not indicate danger. Such was his impression; but as he sat at table with the king, Douglas and his brother David, and his chief confidant, Sir Malcolm Fleming, were suddenly arrested by armed men; and after a brief trial, or probably without any trial at all, hurried to execution: a deed of perfidy which even in that unscrupulous age was universally execrated.

By the murder of the earl of Douglas and his brother, the great estates of that family were divided: their uncle, James, lord of Abercorn, succeeding to the earldom of Douglas, and their only sister, Margaret, the "Fair Maid of Galloway," to all the unentailed estates. In a few years, however, the power of that great baronial house was revived in the person of William, eighth earl of Douglas, and son of James, who married the "Fair Maid of Galloway." The house of Douglas became as formidable as ever to the crown. The new earl for some time paid no regard to the authority of the king or the laws of his country. With a design of bringing Livingstone and Crichton, who had the chief direction of affairs, into contempt, he, like his cousin, who had been murdered by them, encouraged and protected his retainers in their lawless ravages. When, however, King James had reached his fourteenth year, Douglas changed his plan of policy. At the same time he still resolved to take revenge on Livingstone and Crichton. Douglas came to court, where he made the most solemn professions of loyalty, and by his submissive behaviour to the king, and his liberality to the courtiers, he became prime favourite with both. Observing the increasing favour of their powerful enemy, Livingstone and Crichton resigned their offices, and retired from court; the former to his house of Callender, and the latter to the castle of Edinburgh, of which he had the custody. But having now all power in the State, Douglas determined not to let them escape so easily. By his influence they were denounced as rebels by a parliament which met at Perth in July, 1445, and their estates confiscated. Douglas besieged the castle of Edinburgh, while his friends were employed in executing the sentence against Livingstone and Crichton, by seizing their lands and castles. Both the earl and his friends met with stern opposition in their operations. Crichton made so brave a defence of the castle of Edinburgh, that Douglas was compelled to enter into a negotiation with him, and it was finally agreed that, on his surrendering it to the king, he should be pardoned and restored to his estates and honours. He became seemingly reconciled to Douglas, but distrusting the sincerity of the earl's reconciliation, he shunned the court as much as possible. As regards Livingstone, he and his family contended with

PALACE IN EDINBURGH CASTLE

those employed by Douglas so fiercely that the country became a scene of slaughter and desolation; and, after all, he escaped, though the contest cost the lives of several members of his family, and uprooted the power of the faction.

Douglas was now all powerful in the state. He possessed both the favour of the king and the direction of affairs. He was constituted lord lieutenant of the kingdom. His brothers, also, shared in the favour of James. Archibald was created earl of Moray; Hugh, earl of Ormond; and John, Lord Balveny. No family in Scotland ever possessed so much power and territory as did that of Douglas at this period. And their loyalty seemed to be genuine. In a brief war which broke out between England and Scotland, arising from mutual incursions on the borders, the earl of Ormond and Lord Balveny, by their deeds of valour, gained great honour. There were none so great in the kingdom as the Douglases. But from this time their greatness began to decline. James became jealous of their power, and his nobles envious. The people, too, it is said, hated them. James appears to have looked upon the great earl as a rival potentate. His destruction was resolved upon. But it was no easy matter to overthrow his power. Both policy and force were tried and failed. In the year 1450 Douglas went to Rome, where he was received as though he was a king, and while he was absent James took and demolished his castle, and commanded his rents to be seized to indemnify those who had suffered from the lawlessness of his retainers; but on his return, the king was compelled to make his peace with him. At this time Livingstone had been again received into favour. He had lately been made high justiciary, and as Crichton now moved about the court as freely as ever, it is evident that they were plotting his downfall. And his conduct after he returned from Rome, as it had been before he went there, laid him open to the hostility of the government. He had promised James on his return to behave for the future as became a loyal subject, but instead of this he paid no respect to the authority either of the king or the laws of his country. He was suspected of a traitorous correspondence with England, and it is certain that he had entered into a bond with the earls of Crawford and Ross, to stand by and assist each other against all men in direct opposition to an act of parliament against such bonds. His vassals, too, were still allowed to carry on the work of plunder. Those of Annandale, for instance, plundered the lands, and carried off the cattle of a neighbouring lord, and when he sought to recover his property by his armed friends and tenants, he was made prisoner; and when taken to the earl was ordered to be hanged. The aim of Douglas appears to have been to increase his partisans, and destroy all those who were opposed to him. Alarmed at his display of power, James summoned Douglas to appear at court. He came, but he would not appear before a safe conduct was granted him. The court was then at Stirling, and Douglas was received with all due honour. He supped with James, and they appeared as great friends as ever. But scarcely was that supper over when there was a quarrel between them. James complained of his late conduct, and demanded that the bond into which he had entered with the earls of Crawford and Ross should be instantly given up, and Douglas sternly refused. High words passed between them, in the midst of which the king, in a transport of rage, drew his dagger, and laid the great earl dead at his feet: and thus by foul assassination he rid himself of this powerful earl of Douglas.

The great earl left no issue; but he had a brother who swore to revenge his death. That brother, James, at the head of some of the Douglas family, proceeded to the market-place of Stirling, and there proclaimed the king a perjured murderer and an enemy of mankind. If all the members of that family had been united, King James by his rash act would have placed himself in the utmost jeopardy. But the earl of Angus and the lord of Dalkeith were on the side of the king. James, earl of Douglas, therefore, and those who had placed him at their head, after setting fire to some parts of the town of Stirling, took their departure. The earl afterwards burnt the town and besieged the castle of Dalkeith, and sent his brother, the earl of Moray, into the north, against the earls of Angus and Huntly; but both these expeditions were unsuccessful. Discouraged by the ill success he met with in his attempt to revenge his brother's death, he concluded an accommodation with the king; and his submission appeared to be so sincere that, in the year 1453, he was appointed one of the plenipotentiaries to negotiate the prolongation of the truce with England. But his submission was feigned. While the murderer lived his vengeance never slept. While acting as the king's plenipotentiary in England, he employed himself in preparing a formidable rebellion against the king. This rebellion was quelled; for although he was enabled to raise an army of thirty thousand men by his intrigues, yet, when on his return to Scotland he placed himself at their head, on the approach of a royal army he delayed to give battle, on which many of his troops went over to the king, and he was compelled to flee and take refuge in England. This rebellion occurred A.D. 1454; and in a parliament held in July in the succeeding year, Douglas and some of his adherents were attainted, and their estates confiscated. But he was not yet crushed. In that year he again collected an army, English as well as Scots, and this time he ventured a battle in Annandale, but was signally defeated. His brother, Archibald, earl of Moray, was slain; his brother, Hugh, earl of Ormond, was taken and beheaded; but he again escaped into England. In a parliament which met on the 4th of August, the earl's attainder was confirmed, and it was declared to be high treason to give him either assistance or entertainment in Scotland; but in the year 1456 he was again enabled to march across the borders. This time Donald, lord of the Isles, a fierce ambitious chieftain, was banded with him. Provoked at the annexation of the earldom of Ross, that had formerly belonged to his family, to the crown, Donald engaged to raise a rebellion in the north while Douglas invaded the kingdom in the south. His army on this, as on the former occasion, consisted of Scottish and English troops, and he was accompanied in his enterprise by the earl of Northumberland, but he was a third time defeated, and com-

pelled to recross the borders. Donald, lord of the Isles, had in the meantime burnt the town of Inverness, and destroyed a great extent of country with fire and sword; but hearing of the defeat of the confederates, he sought and obtained pardon for his rebellion. Tranquillity was once more restored, and James spent the interval of peace, in conjunction with his parliament, in acts of legislation for the defence and prosperity of his kingdom. So successful were these laws, that at the close of the session of A.D. 1457, the three estates expressed their joy "that God of his grace had sent their lord and sovereign such progress and prosperity, that all his rebels and breakers of his justice were removed out of his realm, and no masterful party remained that might cause any breaking in his realm." But though James, earl of Douglas, made no further attempt at invasion, he was still the bitter enemy of the Scottish king. In his various invasions he had been assisted by the court of Henry VI., of which King James had justly complained; and although he at first received a haughty reply, yet when the Yorkists began to obtain the ascendancy, harmony was restored between the courts of England and Scotland. A truce was concluded between the two countries, which was to last till the year 1463, but, in the meantime, the contest between the houses of York and Lancaster had approached a crisis. In that contest, James, earl of Douglas, mingled. Deserted by the Lancastrian party, he espoused the cause of the Yorkists, and by his intrigues with that party he was instrumental in fomenting those differences which eventually led the Scottish king, soon after Margaret of Anjou had taken refuge in his dominions, to raise an army and invade England. The castle of Roxburgh had been in the hands of the English for more than a century, and in the year 1460 it was held by the Yorkists. It was with the House of Lancaster that King James had concluded a truce, and, therefore, as the Yorkists were now predominant, he had no scruples in breaking it. It is said, indeed, that James was instigated to undertake the siege of Roxburgh by Henry VI.; or rather, it may be concluded, by Queen Margaret. That siege was fatal to his life. The town was taken and destroyed, but the castle was defended with great bravery, and the siege had not lasted many days when one of the cannons that were pointed against the fortress, burst on being fired off, as King James stood by its side, and he was killed on the spot. James, earl of Douglas, was revenged.

The crown of Scotland again fell to the lot of a minor. James had married, in the year 1449, Mary of Guelders, by whom he left three sons and two daughters. He was succeeded on his throne by his eldest son, James III., then in the seventh year of his age. At the time of her husband's death, Mary of Guelders was in the camp, and sinking her grief, she excited the Scottish nobles to persevere in the siege with redoubled ardour, and the garrison capitulated: Roxburgh was dismantled. The young king was brought to the camp at Roxburgh, and he received the homage of his barons at the neighbouring monastery of Kelso, where, according to Buchan, he was crowned. His accession was well-nigh attended by a civil war. In settling the administration, which was effected by a parliament held at Edinburgh early in the year 1461, there were fierce disputes among the barons; one party wishing to raise the queen dowager to the regency, in the hope of governing in her name, and the other opposing it, in hopes of their own advancement. The matter was finally compromised, thus: the queen mother was to have the custody of the young king and the rest of her family, and a council of regency was established, consisting of nobles of both parties. By this arrangement the peace and good government of the country was for a time secured. Early in the reign of James III. there were contests between England and Scotland, but these have been recorded in the history of his contemporary, Edward IV. Hostilities between the two kingdoms ceased in the spring of 1464, after the battle of Hexham, which ruined the Lancastrians, when a truce for fifteen years was concluded at York; a truce to which, at a subsequent date, forty years were added, which prolonged it to A.D. 1519; a much longer period than there was any probability of its being observed.

Among the council of regency established by the parliament at Edinburgh, was James Kennedy, bishop of St. Andrew's. Kennedy was nearly related to the royal family, and his royal descent, his sacred function, and his rare abilities, procured him great influence in the administration—an influence which he constantly employed for the good of the king and the kingdom. While he lived we read of no rivalries among the nobles for place and power. Within three months after his death, however, which occurred in May, 1466, a great change came over both the court and the country. The Douglases and the Livingstones had passed away, and the Boyds and the Hamiltons appear on the stage, to enact nearly the same parts as they had done before them. The ambition of the family of the Boyds was unbounded. Their rise to grandeur was rapid, and equally rapid was their downfall. At this time, Robert, lord Boyd of Kilmarnock, the head of that family, was high justiciary and a member of the regency. His brother, Sir Alexander Boyd, was also about the court. As an accomplished knight, he was the instructor of the young king in riding, tilting, and other martial exercises. These brothers, by their winning manners, became great favourites of the young king; and on the death of Bishop Kennedy, they were not slow in taking advantage of it. Knowing the interest they had in the boy's affection, they formed a plot to get the entire possession of his person for their selfish and ambitious purposes. To this end, they instilled into his tender mind a bitter hatred of the lord Kennedy and others engaged in his education. They were too rigid, they represented, and as he was now thirteen years of age he ought to assume the reins of government, and command those whom he now obeyed. It was a pleasing tale to pour into the boy-king's ears, and he readily fell into their views. A plan was concerted to deliver him from his rigid educators, and to make him a real king. James was at Linlithgow and one morning in July, Sir Alexander Boyd came thither with a few friends to take him out a hunting. The lord Boyd, Somerville, and other chieftains, at the head of a body of men well armed and mounted,

were in the vicinity waiting for the young king, and as soon as he joined them they galloped off in company for Edinburgh. Lord Kennedy was soon informed of this, and, taking horse, followed after them; but when he had overtaken them, on laying his hand on the bridle of the king's horse, and endeavouring to persuade him to return, he was struck by the hunting-staff of Sir Alexander Boyd, and he returned to Linlithgow vowing revenge. It had recently been declared high treason, by an act of parliament, for any one to carry away the king from his appointed place of residence, and to ward off any danger that might arise from this act, a parliament was called at Edinburgh, in which the king, well instructed in his lesson, made a solemn declaration that what had been done was in obedience to his own commands, and that neither the Boyds nor their friends should ever be called into question for their conduct. This declaration was inserted in the registers of parliament, and a copy of it was delivered to the lord Boyd under the great seal; and thus, at least for a time, he and his friends were safe. The Boyds became greater in the kingdom than ever. Lord Boyd was already high justiciary, governor of the king and kingdom: in the year 1467, by a commission under the great seal, he was made lord high chamberlain for life. To crown all, he obtained the consent of the king and a committee of lords, which had been invested by the parliament which met at Edinburgh with full parliamentary powers to act till the next session, to the marriage of the princess Mary, the eldest sister of James, with my lord Boyd's eldest son, Sir Thomas, who was created earl of Arran, and who obtained several valuable estates with his bride. The Boyds were now raised as high as subjects could be raised, and their grandeur seemed built upon a solid foundation. They had become connected with the royal family by marriage; they filled the highest offices in the kingdom; and they had immense estates and numerous powerful friends. Moreover, they revelled in the smiles and favours of the young king. But all this was but a prelude to their ruin. The lord Kennedy had not forgotten the blow he had received from Sir Alexander Boyd's hunting-staff, and he was watching his opportunity for revenge; and that opportunity came in an unexpected manner. In the year 1468, the Boyds successfully negotiated a marriage between the young king and Margaret, only daughter of Christian, king of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway. Margaret was famed for her beauty, and her marriage portion was fixed at sixty thousand florins of the Rhine: ten thousand of which was to be paid before she left Denmark, and the Orkney Isles were to be put into the possession of the young king till the sum was paid in full. Accordingly, in the spring of A.D. 1469, the earl of Arran was sent with a fleet and a splendid retinue to bring the king's bride to Scotland. At that time, King Christian was at war with his Swedish subjects, and could not spare the ten thousand florins; so a new treaty was entered into, by which a fifth part only was paid down, and the Shetland Isles were mortgaged for the remainder. This new treaty does not appear to have given any offence at the Scottish court; but, unfortunately, the earl of Arran was in no haste to bring home the royal bride. While the young king was impatient to receive her, he lingered at Copenhagen. This was fatal to the interests of himself and his family. The Kennedys, who were nearly related to the king, and had free access to him, now whispered a tale in his ears to which he as readily listened as to that by which the Boyds had induced him to place himself in their hands. They had, it was represented, abused his favour by engrossing all the power and emoluments of the government to the exclusion of the other nobles, who had thereby become disaffected; they had disgraced his family by the marriage of the princess Mary to the earl of Arran; and it was more than hinted that they had designs upon the crown, and that neither the king nor his brothers were safe in the hands of that aspiring family. That was sufficient: the young king now hated the Boyds as fervently as he had loved them. There was a parliament called in November at Edinburgh, and the Boyds were summoned to appear before it to answer for the crime of treason: "for that they had taken the king out of the exchequer at Linlithgow, and had brought him to Edinburgh *against* his will." Finding his enemies too powerful for him, Lord Boyd fled into England, and he and his son, the earl of Arran, who was still in Denmark, were tried in their absence, found guilty, and all their estates were confiscated. Sir Alexander Boyd appeared to answer for himself, and pleaded "not guilty," but the jury of lords and barons returned an adverse verdict, and he was condemned and beheaded on the castle hill of Edinburgh. All the immense estates of the Boyd family were annexed to the crown. Hoping to be restored to favour, the earl of Arran sailed from Copenhagen in May, 1470, with the young queen; but when he arrived in the Frith of Forth he was met by his wife, the princess Mary, who had made her escape in disguise from Edinburgh, and finding from her there was no hope of pardon, he returned to Denmark. Mary accompanied him in his exile, and for a time refused to abandon him and return to her home; but in the year 1473, hopes being held out that if she returned she might procure his restoration to his honours and estates, she reappeared at her brother's court. It is said that she made every effort to obtain the earl's pardon, but that it was in vain; by some process, indeed, she was divorced, and her marriage with the earl of Arran dissolved. How this was effected is uncertain, and whether Mary gave her consent or not is uncertain; but it is strange that one who had shown such deep affection for her husband as to go into voluntary exile with him, should, soon after the dissolution of their union, give her hand to another. Yet so it was; for in June, 1474, she was married to James, Lord Hamilton.

The most conspicuous figures that appear in Scottish history, after the downfall of the family of the Boyds, are those of the duke of Albany and the earl of Mars—the only brothers of the king. The character of the duke and the earl was the very opposite to that of King James. This difference in character, in the year 1477, produced the most fatal consequences. King James had at this time imbibed a singular taste for that period, and especially as regards Scotland; namely, for that of the fine arts. Its nobles were

warlike, and held those arts in contempt. This contempt was shared by the duke of Albany and the earl of Mars. They could not conceive how their brother could surround himself as he did with musicians and painters. And yet they it was who possessed a large share of his favour and bounty. It redounds to his honour that he should have preferred the arts of peace to those of war; at all times more useful and ennobling. But the duke and the earl did not think so, and the Scottish nobles were of their opinion. The king's tastes were despised by them. He became the object of their ridicule, and his low-born favourites the objects of their hatred. The earl of Mars, who was young, fierce, and passionate, kept no watch over his lips concerning his brother's unkingly tastes. He expressed the strongest resentment against him, and uttered fearful threats of vengeance against his minions. James could ill brook such conduct, even from a brother. It is probable he conceived that the two princes had a design upon his throne, and that their existence was dangerous to his power. At all events, the earl of Mars was arrested, and imprisoned in the Canongate, where he died. He was arrested on the insane charge of seeking to destroy the king's life by witchcraft, in which James was a devout believer; but whether he was put to death by the royal order, as one account says, or whether, as Hawthornden records, his death was the result of a fever and frenzy, into which the excess of his rage at his confinement had thrown him, is not clear. But whatever was the cause of his death, it had an untoward effect on the warlike Scottish nobles. Their rage against the king and his favourites became fiercer than ever. The duke of Albany became as unguarded in his expressions as his brother, the earl of Mars, had been. He threatened the most fearful vengeance on the king; and he was committed to close custody in the castle of Edinburgh. It is evident that his life was in danger. He had only one page in attendance upon him, and therefore was powerless. But the duke was more fortunate than the earl of Mars, his brother, for he escaped from his prison, and got safe to France, where Louis IX. not only generously entertained him, but procured for him an honourable marriage with a daughter of the earl of Boulogne, with whom he received an ample fortune. So interested was the French king in his welfare, that he sent a learned doctor of the Sorbonne, as his ambassador, to James, to entreat him to be reconciled to his brother; but, although he was charmed with the eloquence of the learned doctor, both in his preaching and conversation, the offence which the duke had committed was too deep to be forgiven. The mission was fruitless.

It would appear that the duke of Albany endeavoured to obtain assistance from the king of France to make war against his brother, and that Louis would not listen to his overtures. Edward IV., king of England, however, was not so scrupulous. The truce still subsisted between the two countries; but although the English king had expressed his full determination to keep it inviolate, and had even concluded a contract of marriage between the prince of Scotland and his youngest daughter, yet by the intrigues of the duke of Albany, and the discontented Scottish nobles, in the year 1480 war between the two countries was suddenly rekindled. The characteristics of this war for two years were border forays, and great preparations for attacks and defence, but in the year 1482 it assumed a more formidable aspect. In that year the duke of Albany sailed from France into England, and entered into a treaty with Edward IV., in which he boldly assumed the title of Alexander, king of Scotland, and consented to receive the crown—if it could be wrested from the hands of his brother—from the English monarch as a gift, and to own him as his lord superior. It was in consequence of this agreement that Richard, duke of Gloucester, accompanied by the duke of Albany and the earl of Northumberland, marched into Scotland and captured the town of Berwick, and took possession of Edinburgh, as recorded in a previous page. Had the army of James been faithful to him, Gloucester's triumphant march might have been impeded. He had raised a numerous body of troops to resist the invasion, but when he had arrived at the town of Lauder, he discovered that there was treachery in the camp. At this time, Archibald, earl of Angus, one of the family of the Douglases, was the most powerful nobleman in Scotland. He had obtained many of the estates of the exiled earl of Douglas, who was in league with the duke of Albany, and by marriage was the son-in-law of the late regent, Robert, Lord Boyd. He was high in favour with the king, and had, on more than one occasion, quelled rebellions against him. James put implicit faith in his loyalty and patriotism. But Archibald, earl of Angus, with all his seeming loyalty and patriotism, in heart was a traitor. He was deeply engaged in the treasonable schemes of the duke of Albany Accordingly, when he marched with the king to meet the invading force, under the duke of Gloucester, it was only to defeat the expedition in which he engaged. While at Lauder, there was a meeting at midnight in the church, to decide as to the best means of distressing the king, and defeating his expedition. It is recorded that at this meeting one of the members repeated this fable:—"The mice held a meeting to consult about the best means of preserving themselves from the cats. One mouse proposed to hang a bell about the cat's neck, that by its ringing when the cat moved, they might have warning of their danger. But when it was asked, which of them would bell the cat? not a mouse among them was found to have so much courage." The design of this fable was plain. It was to discover who possessed the necessary courage to overawe the king. Who? why Archibald, the earl of Angus, in whom the king had so much trusted. He undertook to "bell the cat," and he did it with a vengeance. Early in the morning he entered the royal tent with a body of armed men, and there seized six of the king's most favoured confidants—men of considerable talent and taste for the age, on whom he had lavished wealth and honours—and after upbraiding the king for spending his time in such unworthy company, carried them off, and hanged them over the bridge of Lauder. Struck with consternation at this outrage, James fled with some of his nobles to the castle of Edinburgh, where he was when Gloucester, with the duke of Albany, took possession of the city.

It is difficult to conceive why the scheme of conquest which the dukes had in view was not carried out, for there could have been no effectual opposition made to it. The army of James had disbanded when he fled from Lauder, and the utmost confusion prevailed in the country, from the factions into which the nobility were divided. But after a short time a reconciliation was effected. James was released from the castle at Edinburgh; the duke of Albany was appointed lord-lieutenant of the kingdom; and Richard, duke of Gloucester, returned to England.

The whole power of the crown fell into the hands of the duke of Albany, for he was not only constituted lieutenant-general of the kingdom, but he became lord high admiral and warden both of the east and west marches. For his "fidelity, loyalty, fraternal affection, and faithful services," also, he had a grant made him by the king of the earldoms of Mars and Garioch, which, with his estates of Albany, March, Annandale, and the Isle of Man, made him as opulent as he was powerful. For a time the brothers lived in harmony. Albany expressed the warmest professions of inviolable love and loyalty to the king, and the king loaded him with favours in token of his complete reconciliation with and affection towards Albany. But the seeming reconciliation of these royal brothers was of transient duration. Early in the year 1483, the duke of Albany was again in rebellion. Under a pretence that his life was in danger, he retired from court and shut himself up in his strong castle of Dunbar, from whence he renewed his treasonable correspondence with England. Commissioners, consisting of his most zealous partisans and the bitterest enemies of his brother, among whom was Archibald Bell-the-Cat, earl of Angus, were sent by him to renew the treaty with Edward IV., and it was again agreed that on certain conditions—conditions even more dishonourable than those which had characterized the previous treaty—the English king would assist him to dethrone his brother, and seat him on the throne of Scotland. But the effects of this treaty were set aside by the death of Edward, king of England, which took place in less than two months after it was concluded. Discovering the traitorous correspondence of his brother with the court of England, James summoned him to appear before a parliament that was to meet at Edinburgh, in June, to answer to a charge of high treason; but he made his escape into England. Albany was tried in his absence by his peers, and was found guilty and condemned to death; all his estates and honours being confiscated. And there was now no hope of his ever being restored to his country. On his arrival in England he found everything in confusion. His bosom friend, the duke of Gloucester, had usurped that throne, and he required all his power to retain it; so that he had no troops to assist him to the throne of Scotland. At first, indeed, Richard showed some inclination to aid his pretensions, but he soon found that it was his wisdom to terminate the war with Scotland, and accordingly, after a brief negotiation, a peace was concluded in September, 1484, which was to last for three years. In the meantime, Albany and the long exiled earl of Douglas tried their fortunes in the field. With a body of five hundred horsemen, chiefly composed of the robbers and plunderers on the English borders, they entered Annandale, and approached the town of Lochmaben. This was in June, when the fair of that town was held, and the people, as was their custom, having their arms to protect their goods, aided by some neighbouring lords and gentlemen, opposed the invaders. There was a fierce conflict, in which the fair people and their adherents were the victors. The old earl of Douglas was taken prisoner and carried to Edinburgh. The sentence of death had been years before recorded against him, but instead of commanding his execution, James ordered him to be confined in the abbey of Lindores for life. The duke of Albany escaped into England; but soon after his return, he went to the court of France where, in a tournament, he received a wound of which he died.

Such are the leading features of Scottish history during this period; the remainder of the reign of James III. belongs to the early years of the age of the Tudors.

CHAPTER II.

History of Laws and Government, from A.D. 1399 to A.D. 1485.

SECTION I.

Disturbed as England was during this period by civil wars and disputed titles to the crown, which left comparatively but little time for legislation and judicial improvement, nevertheless, the constitution, government, and laws made some progress towards that happy condition in which we now find them. Compared with those of other countries they were, according to Philip de Comines, no mean authority, examples to be copied; for after describing the disorders that prevailed in the governments of France, Germany, and Italy, and the cruel oppressions under which the people of those countries groaned, he remarks:—"Of all the states of the world that I know, England is the country where the commonwealth is best governed, and the people least oppressed."

There had been a great struggle in the previous period by the lower orders for their rights and privileges, the fruits of which were seen in this. It is true that slaves were still numerous, and that there are instances of men, especially prisoners of war,

being bought and sold like cattle; but the number of slaves was considerably diminished, and the condition of those who remained in bondage very greatly improved. Whatever slaves existed, whether domestic or predial, were chiefly to be found on the demesnes of prelates and great barons. Other proprietors preferred to have their lands cultivated by freemen—men who would perform a fair day's work for a fair day's wages. We find that, at the request of the commons many laws were made for increasing the number of such labourers, and for the regulation of the remuneration they were to receive for their labours. These laws may not have been enacted in the truest spirit of wisdom, but still they had a tendency to better the condition of the lower classes. They might have prevented them from rising to fame and greatness, which no law of the present day can do if the poorest amongst us possess talent, but still they had a tendency to raise them in the scale of society. It was the dawn of a better era, an era when the son of a peasant may, by the overrulings of Providence, take his station among the highest born in the land. But, after all, small thanks were due to the nobles and proprietors of lands at this period for relaxing the old debasing system of villanage. There was considerable self-interest displayed in the matter. They had discovered that slaves who laboured not for themselves but for their masters, were more prone to be indolent and refractory than those who worked for hire. Their work was performed to better purpose and at less expense by hired servants than by slaves. Moreover, the almost incessant wars in which the nation was engaged compelled them to put arms into the hands of their villains to protect their property, and thus disposed them to look upon the lower classes as something better than mere beasts of burden; as men who, if they were not worthy of rising to fame or greatness, were, nevertheless, useful members of society.

Hume remarks:—"The constitution of the English government ever since the invasion of this island by the Saxons may boast of this pre-eminence, that in no age the will of the monarch was entirely ever absolute and uncontrolled." This is strictly true. Richard II. had aimed at absolute power, and, in a certain sense, obtained it; but his hands were too weak to sustain his tyranny. Aided by the commons, his nobles hurled him from his throne, and gave the crown to his cousin of Bolingbroke. "In that revolution," observes Mr. Hallam, "there was as remarkable an attention shown to the formalities of the constitution—allowance being made for the men and the times—as in that of 1688. The parliament was not opened by commission; no one took the office of president; the commons did not adjourn to their own chamber; they chose no speaker; the name of parliament was not taken, but that only of estates of the realm. But as it would have been a violation of constitutional principles to assume a parliamentary character without the king's commission, though summoned by his writ, so it was still more essential to limit their exercise of power to the necessity of circumstances. Upon the cession of the king, as upon his death, the parliament was no more; its existence as the council of the sovereign being dependent upon his will. The actual convention summoned by the writs of Richard could not legally become the parliament of Henry; the validity of a statute declaring it to be such would probably have been questionable in that age, when the power of statutes to alter the original principles of the common law was by no means so thoroughly recognized as at the Restoration and Revolution. Yet Henry was too well pleased with his friends to part with them so readily, and he had much to effect before the fervour of their spirits should abate. Hence an expedient was devised of issuing writs for a new parliament returnable in six days. These neither were nor could be complied with; but the same members as had deposed Richard sat in the new parliament, which was regularly opened by Henry's commissioner, as if they had been duly elected."

It has been seen in former pages that the power of the commons had made a great advance in the reign of Richard II.; a circumstance chiefly arising from his personal character. They had acquired the right of directing the application of subsidies, and of impeaching the king's ministers for misconduct. Under the House of Lancaster this newly-acquired power became more and more established, and in after-days, though occasionally checked, it took such deep root in the constitution that it could not be overthrown. But the Plantagenets were not disposed to allow the power of the commons to become formidable to the crown. In the second year of Henry IV. an attempt was made by them to make supply depend upon redress of grievances, by demanding that answers might be given to their petitions before they granted their subsidy. But in this they were unsuccessful. Henry replied that it had never been known in the time of his ancestors, that petitions were answered before they had done all their business in parliament, whether of granting money or any other matter, and, therefore, he would not alter the customs and usages of ancient times.

At this period the elections of representatives, together with their wages and privileges, became the subject of various laws and political regulations, which had considerable influence on the constitution of the house of commons. For several years knights of shires were elected as in the previous period—that is, by every freeholder in the shires in which they resided. In some counties the small freeholders were very numerous, and such a mode of election was found to be inconvenient, as it gave rise to scenes of riot and violence. These small freeholders were evidently those who had passed out of the servile condition into the free, and had become the real constituents of the country. But extensive suffrage was then, as is now, by some held to be dangerous to the welfare of the country. To remedy the evil, supposed or real, in the reign of Henry VI., A.D. 1429, a law was enacted that the knights of shires should be chosen in every county by people dwelling and resident in the same counties, whereof every one of them should have free land or tenement, of the value of forty shillings by the year at least, above all deductions. In like manner the representatives of cities and burghs were chosen only by actual residents therein, but whether by the whole bodies of citizens and burgesses, or by the corporations, is not clearly known. In the writs issued to the

sheriffs the qualifications of representatives of counties, cities, and boroughs, were distinctly defined. Freeholders in counties were to choose two of the fittest and most discreet knights resident in the county; but as in some counties such knights could not be found, by an Act passed, A.D. 1444, they were permitted to choose non-residents; but they were to be "notable esquires, gentlemen by birth, and qualified to be made knights," and not "yeomen or persons of inferior rank." These gentlemen were to have in their possession freehold estates of the value of 40*l.* a year clear of all deduction, otherwise they were not duly qualified to sit in parliament. By the same writs, the electors in cities and boroughs were directed to choose the fittest and most discreet persons, freemen *of* and residing in the places for which they were chosen, and no others upon any pretence. And all representatives, whether in counties, cities, or boroughs, were not only to be the wisest, but the stoutest men the electors could find. They were to have a sound body, that they might be able to endure the fatigues of the journey, and of close attendance to their duties; and a sound mind, that they might comprehend the nature of those duties, and legislate accordingly.

Various laws were enacted in this period for regulating the manner of proceeding in the election of members of the house of commons, and for preventing false returns; but notwithstanding these laws, there were great irregularities. For a series of years, for instance, the knights for the county of York were not chosen by the freeholders, but by the attorneys of a few lords and ladies who had great estates in that county. In the reign of Henry VI., the knights, citizens, and burgesses, which sat in a parliament held at Coventry, A.D. 1460, were not elected at all, but were named by the king in letters under the privy seal, and returned by the sheriffs, who obtained an act of indemnity for that breach of their trust. In this instance, the sheriffs acted in accordance with the royal will and pleasure; but in numerous other instances they were guilty of great abuses in conducting elections and making their returns. Grave charges were laid against them in the preamble of an act of parliament, which was passed in the year 1444, the object of which was to make them amenable for their conduct. That preamble reads thus:—"Divers sheriffs of the counties of the realm of England, for their singular avail and lucre, have not made due elections of the knights, nor in convenient time, nor good men and true returned, and sometimes no return of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, lawfully chosen to come to parliament; but such knights, citizens, and burgesses have been returned which were never duly chosen, and other citizens and burgesses than those which, by the mayors and bailiffs, were to the said sheriffs returned. And sometimes the sheriffs have not returned the writs which they had to make, of elections of knights to come to the parliament, but the said writs have embezzled; and, moreover, made no precept to the mayor and bailiff, or to the bailiff or bailiffs, where no mayor is, of cities and boroughs, for the election of citizens and burgesses to come to the parliament." This act seems to have had some effect, for it was shortly after this that the freeholders of the county of York resumed their violated rights, which had been usurped by the lords and ladies of the county for about thirty years. Severe penalties were enacted against delinquent sheriffs. Thus, by the statute of Henry VI., A.D. 1444, a convicted sheriff was liable to this heavy punishment; to pay 100*l.* to the king, 100*l.* to the injured candidate, which was equivalent to 2000*l.*, and to be imprisoned a whole year. It is supposed that the reason of this severity was that, parliament being of such brief duration, members deprived of their seats by false returns could scarcely hope to recover them in time.

The custom of representatives receiving wages, which were paid by their constituents, still prevailed. The knights of shires still received four shillings, and citizens and burgesses two shillings per diem, as in the days of Edward III. The proudest and richest among them thought it no dishonour to receive their wages, and even to sue for them if they were not duly paid. But they were not paid if they had not constantly attended to their duties as legislators. Writs were issued for their expenses at the dissolution of parliament; but if they had not attended from the first to the last day those writs were withheld, and their constituents became aware of their negligence by not being called upon to pay them for their services. But besides receiving wages, members of the house of commons had certain privileges. Thus, not only their own persons, but those of their secretary, servants, and attendants were secured from arrests from the time of their setting out to the performance of their parliamentary duties till the day of their return, but not in the intervals between one session of parliament and another. It was, therefore, only during the term of their services that their pay and their privileges extended; or from the time of their leaving to the time of their returning home.

As regards the peers, they paid their own expenses: their services being performed for the baronies they held of the crown. Of the composition of the house of lords very little is known. On this subject, Mr. Hallam observes:—"The ancient temporal peers are supposed to have been intermingled with persons who held nothing of the crown by barony; but attended by parliament, solely by virtue of the king's prerogative, exercised in the writ of summons. These have been called barons by writ; and it seems to be denied by no one, that, at least under the three Edwards, there were some of this description in parliament. But after all the labours of Dugdale, and others, in tracing the genealogies of an ancient aristocracy, it is a problem of much difficulty to distinguish these from the territorial barons." As in the former period, barons were created by writ, statute, and patent. Those created by writ, Mr. Hallam holds that, by its virtue, they did not acquire an hereditary nobility; but that they nevertheless had a decisive voice in the deliberations of the legislature. In the house of lords the clergy still had great influence. In truth, at this time, their influence greatly preponderated. This was not so much owing to their superior learning or sanctity, but from their superiority of numbers to those of the temporal peers. They were constant residents in the kingdom, and punctual in attendance at these councils, while the nobles were often engaged in war, either in France or Scotland. Besides the

archbishops and prelates, abbots and priors were summoned to parliament, and on some occasions the spiritual lords doubled the number of the temporal lords, and thus the influence of the clergy was greater than that of the lay barons. It was this that enabled the prelates to procure sanguinary laws against the Lollards, which will be noticed in a future page, and to secure the wealth and the errors and superstitions of the church from all attacks.

The sessions of parliament were still of brief duration. The two longest parliaments in this period were those of Henry IV., A.D. 1407, and of Henry VI., A.D. 1446: the former of which sat in three sessions, 159 days, and the latter in four sessions, 178 days. Long parliaments were not popular either with the members or their constituents; for the former complained of their being kept from their business and diversions, and the latter of the large sums they had to pay their representatives for their services. To a modern reader the complaint of the constituents may appear to be groundless: four shillings per diem for 159 days, for instance, would not amount to much according to the present value of a shilling; but the 80*l.* 8*s.* of that day was equivalent to about 800*l.* of the present time. And it was that sum which the constituents of the shire of Cumberland had to pay their two knights, including their wages for forty-two days in travelling to and fro to attend the three sessions of A.D. 1407. From this we learn that it occupied seven days at that period to travel from Cumberland to Westminster, at which place, it appears, the parliament was then assembled.

But although the sessions of parliament were of brief duration, numerous systems, or bodies of laws, were enacted during this period. Some of these contained only a few, while others consisted of from twenty to thirty statutes. It is evident from this that the legislators of that day did not waste their time in elaborate and useless discussions. We should be almost inclined to think that they came to the point at once, as our present legislators might do in many instances, without so much wordy war in which they are too apt to indulge. The variety of subjects which the laws of this period embraced are too numerous to be recounted. Some explained, amended, and revived former laws; others affirmed the common law, and supplied its defects by inflicting severer penalties on certain crimes, and providing new remedies for new disorders. Twice during the period—in the reign of Henry IV. and Henry V.—the Great Charter and the Charter of the Forests were confirmed, together with all other laws that had not been repealed. But at this time these two famous charters had in a great measure become obsolete, for they were not so much insisted upon as they had been in former ages. The same monarchs who confirmed these charters enacted most cruel laws against the Lollards, who, when convicted of heresy, were consigned to the flames. Other laws were enacted for regulating the qualifications and proceedings of justices of the peace, to whom additional powers were granted. Some of the statutes of this period were unfriendly to strangers who traded or settled in England, especially the Welsh and Irish; but in the reign of Edward IV., who was himself a merchant, and paid great attention to commerce, some valuable laws were enacted for the encouragement of trade and manufactures. But there were two statutes passed in this reign that demand particular attention, inasmuch as they well illustrate the then existing degrees of society.

It has been seen that in the preceding century apparel, or the costume of the people, had obtained the attention of the legislature. The acts then passed defining what dress the different classes of the community were to wear, had evidently become obsolete, for in the year 1463, the subject was again gravely discussed and legislated upon. The two statutes enacted at this period, like that of Edward III., were granted at the prayer of the commons, and have reference only to the averment "that the commons of the realm, as well men and women, have worn, and do daily wear, excessive and inordinate array." The professed objects of the statutes were to restrain the impoverishment of England, and "the final destruction of the husbandry of the realm;" but their real object was to maintain the outward appearance of those distinctions of rank which were fast passing away. The esquire was beginning to tread on the heels of the knight; the yeoman on the heels of the esquire; and the peasantry on the heels of the yeoman. As regards costume, an amalgamation of classes had commenced, and the legislature was called upon to check its growth. Thus by the statutes of Edward IV., the esquire, and gentlemen who had an income of 40*l.* a year, might wear damask or satin; while those who had the same income, if they had acquired it by their own industry, were only to rejoice in furs, and their wives in gilt girdles. All those who possessed less than forty shillings a year were debarred from furs, and fustian, and scarlet cloth; and yeomen and persons under his degree were to have no stuffing in their doublets. As for servants in husbandry and artificers, they were to wear no clothing of which the cloth should cost more than two shillings for the broad yard. Such was the substance of the statute of apparel enacted A.D. 1463. Twenty years later another was passed, still more explicit in its language, for it prescribed what peculiar apparel of cloth of gold or silk should be used by all below the royal rank—what to those below a duke, and what to those below a lord: the knight being allowed to wear velvet only in his doublet. No one under the estate of a lord was to wear cloth of foreign manufacture; and, as in the preceding century, the price of cloth for the apparel of labourers and artificers was defined. But in this last statute the ladies were particularly favoured by the gallant monarch, Edward IV., for the omnipotence of female taste was allowed to reign supreme. By a saving clause in their behalf, it was expressly stated that the act was not to be prejudicial to any woman, "except the wives of servants and labourers." While, therefore, their husbands were only to dress according to law, ladies might wear the costliest array, if their tastes led them thus to bedeck themselves.

The manner of framing laws or acts of parliament underwent a great change for the better in this period. Hitherto it had been the custom of the commons towards the close of a session to present, in the presence of the lords, petitions to the king for redress

of grievances; and if he granted those petitions, they were put into the form of statutes subsequently by the judges and other members of the king's council, and then inserted in the statute roll and transmitted to sheriffs, whose duty it was to promulgate them in their county courts. This custom was attended with dangerous abuses; for it was found that some statutes did not correspond to the petitions of the commons, and that some even appeared in the statute roll *for* which they had never petitioned and *to* which they had never given their consent. To remedy this evil, the commons by degrees learned to draw up their petitions in the form of bills or acts, as they wished them to be passed into laws; and when at the close of the session such bills or acts had been agreed to by the lords, and received the royal assent, the enacting clauses were prefixed to them, as the body of laws passed in that session. Another marked improvement was made in the reign of Richard III. Hitherto all statutes had been expressed either in the Latin or French languages, but in the statutes of that king plain English was adopted. The statutes of Richard III. were also the first that were printed—that most useful art having recently been invented.

The character of Richard as a legislator stands higher than might be expected from his ambitious and turbulent career. Lord Bacon says that he was a "good legislator for the ease and solace of the people." Some of the enactments in his *one* collection of laws were wise and enlightened. Thus, by the 3rd chapter it was enacted that, "forasmuch as divers persons had been daily arrested and imprisoned for suspicion of felony—sometime of malice, and sometime of light suspicion—and so kept in prison without bail or mainprize, to their great vexation and trouble, it be ordained and established, by authority of this present parliament, that every justice of the peace in every shire, city, or town have authority and power, by his or their discretion, to let such prisoners and persons so arrested in bail or mainprize, in like form as though the same prisoners or persons were incited thereof of record afore the same justices in their session." By the same chapter it was enacted that the goods of persons imprisoned for felony should not be seized before conviction. That Richard meant well to the constitution and liberties of the subject at the time of his accession seems to be clear from his prohibition of benevolences; but it may be that by his judicious legislation he was only courting popularity, for it has been seen that when he fancied he was secure on his throne, he became more of a tyrant than a constitutional monarch.

The courts of law remained nearly the same in this as in the former period. But few eminent lawyers flourished therein. The two most eminent were Sir John Fortescue, who was for some time chief justice of the King's Bench, and who went into exile with Edward, son of Henry VI., and others of the Lancastrian party; and Sir Thomas Littleton, who was a judge of the common-pleas in the reign of Edward IV. Both these were legal writers of great eminence. They were bright exceptions to the general body of lawyers, who, though numerous, were not as a rule learned in the law. Sir John Fortescue says, that in his time there were not less than two thousand students in the inns of chancery and the inns of court. But, according to Sir John, many of them did not attend the inns of court for the sole purposes of studying the law. He writes:—"A student could not reside in the inns of court for less than twenty-eight pounds per annum; and proportionably more if he had a servant, as some of them had. For this reason the students of the law were generally sons of persons of quality. Knights, barons, and the greatest of the nobility of the kingdom often placed their children here, not so much to make the laws their study as to form their manners, and to preserve them from the contagion of vicious habits; for all vice was there discountenanced, and everything good and virtuous was taught—as music, dancing, singing, history, sacred and profane, and other accomplishments." The legal profession does not appear at this period to have held out very bright prospects for students. Even those who attained to the high position of the judges of the land were but ill paid for their services. In the year 1439 we find that the judges and the attorney-general presented a petition to parliament complaining of the smallness of their salaries, and declaring that if they did not obtain redress they would be obliged to resign their offices. Whether this was before or after Henry VI. (by letters patent) granted additional salaries to the different judges as before, is uncertain; but if it was subsequent, they still had cause for complaint. It can be no marvel, then, that complaints were common of the corrupt and imperfect administration of justice. A judge, on admission into office, took a solemn oath that he would not receive any fee, pension, gift, reward, or bribe, of any man having suit or plea before him, "saving meat and drink;" but there is too much reason to believe that, from their inadequate salaries to support their station, and also from the precarious nature of their situation, they were not immaculate. Other causes, also, contributed to the mal-administration of justice. The old system of maintenance by which people wearing the same livery confederated together to defend each other in all their claims and pleas, just or unjust, still prevailed. These confederates laid all the peaceable people around them under contribution not to harass them by vexatious law-suits. The clergy, too, still obstructed the path of justice. While they themselves claimed exemptions from the jurisdiction of the civil courts, they were by no means willing to aid the laity in obtaining justice by a legal process. Then, again, the numerous sanctuaries which existed throughout the length and breadth of the land enabled many criminals to escape the punishment due to their crimes, and numerous debtors to avoid the payment of their just debts. Perjury also was a prevailing vice at this period; for numbers hired themselves for witnesses and received bribes when they were on juries; but the greatest obstacles to the due administration of justice were the violent factions and the civil wars which existed in this period. For the most part the people were under a kind of a military and not a judicial government. The dreaded high-constable lived in those times—an officer who was invested with authority to put the greatest subjects of the realm to death noiselessly, without even observing the forms of law, if in his own mind he was convinced they were guilty of

crimes imputed to them. If he had not any proof of their guilt, he could, if he chose, have recourse to torture by the rack or by fire, to obtain the evidence he required. The rack was invented by the duke of Exeter, when high-constable, whence it obtained the singular name of "The duke of Exeter's daughter."

Concerning the common law of this period, Sir John Fortescue writes:—"Touching the reports of the years and terms of Henry IV. and V., they do not arrive, either in the nature of the learning contained in them, or in the judiciousness or knowledge of the judges and pleaders, nor in any other respect arise to the perfection of the last twelve years of Edward III. But the times of Henry VI., as also of Edward IV. and V., were times that abounded with learned and excellent men. There is little odds in the usefulness and learning of these books, only the first part of Henry VI. is more barren, spending itself much in learning of little moment and now out of use; the second part is full of excellent learning."

One of the most remarkable features in the English constitution is the court of equity in chancery. Its origin appears to date from the reign of Richard II., but it was only by slow degrees that it attained to perfection. In earlier times, when a person conceived himself injured by a sentence of the supreme courts of law, he applied by petition and a representation of his case for redress to the fountain of justice—the king. In the lapse of time, however, the English monarchs rid themselves of this most onerous duty, for which few of them had any fitness, by referring these petitions and representations to the lord chancellor, the keeper of the king's conscience, who was one of the greatest officers of the crown, and supposed to be one of the wisest men in the kingdom. This practice appears to have first commenced in the reign of Richard II., who certainly could not be considered in his own person "the fountain of justice." This new judicature was recognised by a statute passed in the reign of Richard II. in these terms:—"Forasmuch as people be compelled to come before the king's council, or in the chancery, by writs granted upon untrue suggestions, the chancellor for the time being, presently after that such suggestions be duly found and proved untrue, shall have power to ordain and award damages according to his discretion, to *him* which is so troubled unduly as afore is said." By a long continuance of the practice thus sanctioned and never repealed, the chancellor came to be considered, both by kings and people, as the officer whose province it was to mitigate the rigorous sentences of strict law by the milder decision of equity. But for several ages the jurisdiction of the court of chancery was limited, and the exercise of it feeble and imperfect. The court of equity in chancery was fully established in the reign of Edward IV., and its business from that time continued to increase, but as the chancellor generally was not a regularly-bred lawyer, but a member of the clerical order, the common law courts looked upon his authority with jealousy and his judgments with contempt. And they might well do so, for it appears that it was the common practice of these clerical chancellors, when they had a point of difficulty whereon to decide, to call in the advice of some of the judges, or to adjourn it into the executive chamber, where it was resolved and discussed according to the opinion of the sages of the common law. But in some instances the clerical chancellor decided on their own judgments, often erroneously and still oftener arbitrarily, which increased the contempt of the common law courts. Finally, however, in the person of Sir Thomas More, the office of chancellor was held by one well qualified by a legal education, and from that time the court of equity in chancery rose rapidly in the public esteem.

The revenues of the kings of England during this period, like their prerogatives, appear to have suffered diminution. In the reign of William the Conqueror, and some of his successors, the crown lands were of immense extent and great value, and combined with the various prestations of their feudal tenants, were sufficient to support the regal dignity with very little dependence on their subjects. But these royal demesnes had, by the expensive wars, profuse grants, and monastic endowments of succeeding monarchs, been greatly limited in their extent, which, as a necessary consequence, materially affected the crown's revenues. The profits also of purveyance, wardship, and the other ancient prerogatives of the crown had been much reduced, either by the acts of the legislature or by the equivalent force of long-established usage. When Henry IV., therefore, ascended the throne, he was chiefly dependent upon parliament for the means of carrying on the government. All the kings of this period, indeed, were dependent on the grants made by their parliaments, which grants were either ordinary or extraordinary. Amongst their ordinary revenues were the several duties and customs on merchandise, called tonnage and poundage. These revenues varied from time to time, inasmuch as parliament fixed the rates sometimes at a higher and sometimes at a lower rate of value. Thus, in the first years of Henry's reign a poundage of sevenpence and a tonnage of two shillings only were levied; but in the fourth year the poundage was fixed at one shilling, and the tonnage at three, or the same which had been levied in the preceding reign of Richard II. These customs' duties were granted to every king as a matter of course; but parliament took care to show them that it had the power of withholding them if it chose. Thus, during the reign of Henry IV. they were granted yearly; but in order to let him see that he was dependent on its will and pleasure, even for his ordinary revenues, one year they were withheld altogether. At no time were these ordinary revenues adequate to the wants of the sovereigns of this period. An account of receipts and expenditure, delivered by his treasurer to Henry V. at Lambeth, in the year 1421, will illustrate this. From that account it appears that the whole stated revenue of the crown amounted only to 55,754*l.* 10*s.* 10½*d.*, or about 557,540*l.*, and that after paying his guards and garrisons, the expenses of his civil government, the salaries of collectors, etc., and pensions to dukes, earls, knights, and others, which were charges on his ordinary revenue, he had only 3,507*l.* 13*s.* 11½*d.* remaining to defray the expenses of his household, his wardrobe, his works, his embassies, and various other charges. As in these times the expense of the king's household alone amounted to 20,000*l.*, equivalent to 200,000*l.* at present, it follows, therefore, that there was an alarming deficit. From the same account we

gather, that many of the debts of Henry IV., his father, as well as those which Henry V. himself had contracted when prince of Wales, remained unpaid, and that great arrears were owing of salaries and pensions, and to his garrisons, household, and wardrobe. In truth, there was no king of this period able to pay his debts except Edward IV., who combined the merchant with the monarch, and who was, beside, for several years in receipt of a considerable pension from the king of France.

The extraordinary revenues of the crown were such as were granted by parliament, on particular occasions, and for particular purposes. For the most part, these grants were made to defray the expenses of a war, and might, therefore, be properly termed a "war tax." They consisted chiefly of tenths or fifteenths of all the moveable goods, both of the clergy and laity: the clergy voluntarily giving them in convocation, and the laity in parliament. To ascertain what each member of the community was entitled to pay, commissioners, or valuers, were appointed in every district, both in town and country. The revenues thus raised greatly varied at different times from a variety of circumstances. Sometimes they were more carefully collected than at others; and sometimes the country was in a more flourishing condition than at others, which would cause a difference at different times in the amounts raised from these extraordinary grants. It is on record, also, that though the clergy in convocation, and the laity in parliament, willingly made these grants, the people were not willing to pay. Before the commissioners came round to take an account of their cattle and goods, they were unpatriotic enough to remove them out of sight. To prevent this an Act was passed, A.D. 1407, ordaining that all persons, and more especially foreigners, should pay according to the cattle and goods they had in any place on the day on which the tenth and fifteenth had been granted; and that the district, town, or county should pay for all the goods and cattle removed after that day. Other extraordinary grants consisted of a tax upon lands and offices above a certain value; of additional duties upon particular commodities for a limited time; and on some few occasions by the imposition of a poll-tax. But even these extraordinary aids, as they are called, fell immeasurably short of the requirements of the kings of this warlike period. It is computed by Hume, that all the extraordinary supplies granted by parliament to Henry V. amounted only to seven tenths and fifteenths, producing about 203,000*l.* Another calculation raises it to about 270,000*l.*; but if we take the larger sum, it was barely sufficient to defray the expenses of his archers and men-at-arms for six months; for each archer had sixpence a day, and each horseman two shillings. It is marvellous how a war of several years' duration, and of such magnitude as that in which he was engaged, was supported. But, as before seen, he borrowed money from all quarters, pawned his jewels, and sometimes the crown itself, and, after all, ran deeply in arrears to his army. Instead of answering the purposes for which they were given, these extraordinary aids added to the difficulties and debts of the monarch to whom they were granted. It is remarkable that the preservation of Calais alone—a fortress of no use to the defence of England, and only served as an inlet to annoy France—was an annual expense to the crown of 19,119*l.*, which was above a third of the common charge of the government in time of peace. The defence of the borders against the Scots, and the support of a force in Ireland to keep down rebellion, were heavy charges on the revenues of the kings of England at this period. It was their heavy, and too frequently reckless, expenditure that led them to have recourse to expedients to obtain money which were neither honourable nor lawful. Henry VI. borrowed but never paid, and his credit became so low that in order to obtain money he had the effrontery to demand voluntary contributions. It is true other kings before him had done the same thing, but under the pressure of his necessities he made his demands more boldly than his predecessors. They had appealed to the liberality of the people to render them voluntary aid, but he made a peremptory demand for the so-called voluntary contributions. Thus, on one occasion, he instructed commissioners to make a collection of this kind for the defence of Calais, in which every man in the kingdom was called upon to contribute the expense of two days' service in the field, on the pretence that he could by law, if he was so disposed, compel all his subjects to attend his wars. A broad hint was even given that if they did not thus tax themselves he would put that law in force. But of all the monarchs of this period, Edward IV. was the most successful in getting money out of the pockets of his people by dishonourable means. We say nothing against his trading, for though it is an unkingly practice, there appears to be no reason why a king should not turn "an honest penny," like the meanest of his subjects. Edward's subjects appear to have been of the same opinion; especially as they conceived the royal gains saved them from heavier taxation. At the same time, as he traded without paying customs, it may be doubted whether his extensive trading was not more hurtful to them than beneficial. But Edward IV. was something lower than a merchant: he was a most inveterate beggar. And yet at his accession, the royal revenue had been greatly increased, for not less than one hundred and forty of the estates of the principal nobility and gentry of England—Lancastrians whom he had crushed—had lapsed by forfeiture to the crown. That such a fortunate possessor of other people's wealth should become a beggar only makes him the more contemptible. It was his wasteful expenditure that brought him to this low estate, for it reduced him to the level of his poorest predecessors. Like a sturdy beggar, he asked alms—benevolences or free gifts as he called them—of the friends who had raised him to the throne, and of any one whom he thought would contribute to his necessities. And there was something novel in his mode of soliciting charity on some occasions. Thus, in the year 1475, after he had expended all the aids granted him in parliament, much of which had been spent in his profligacies, he obtained a list of all the rich lords, ladies, gentlemen, and merchants, and invited them to meet him, and when they arrived he received them with the utmost affability, represented the greatness of his necessities, and entreated them to give him a free gift, according to their abilities. With the ladies

especially, that handsome face of his and his winning manners told amazingly. It is not often a beggar has such a handsome face and such gracious manners, and they proved irresistible. He got a handsome sum on this occasion for his necessities. But it was not only thus in public, that he begged—he sometimes asked an alms privately, and especially of the ladies of his realm. It is related that on one occasion he applied to a rich old widow, who was so charmed with his face and his courtesy, that she told him he should not have less than twenty pounds. It was a liberal sum in those days, and, charmed by her benevolence, Edward showed his gratitude by giving the old lady a kiss; and enraptured at the gallantry of her king, she exclaimed that she would double her donation. But this mode of raising money was not only contemptible in a monarch,—it was dangerous to the liberties of the nation, and hurtful to the welfare of the people. Many were by his blandishments induced to give more than they could afford; and it is doubtful whether the rich old widow did not make a sacrifice to reward Edward for his kiss. That these benevolences had a pernicious effect is clearly shown in the preamble of the Act of Richard III., 1483, which prohibited them from being further practised. It says:—"Many worshipful men of this realm, by occasion of that benevolence, were compelled by necessity to break up their household; and to live in great penury and wretchedness, their debts unpaid, their children unpreferred, and such memorials as they had ordained to be done for the wealth of their souls, were anentized and annulled to the great displeasure of God, and the destruction of this realm." By the latter clause of this statute, it may be gathered that the clergy were unfavourable to the system of "benevolences." And this was natural, for it had this unpleasant tendency: to draw the wealth of the kingdom from the church to the crown. But this statute failed to uproot the system. It was renewed in the reign of Henry VII., and was only finally abolished in that of Charles I., by the Petition of Rights.

The powers and prerogatives of the kings of this period are not distinctly marked, but it seems clear that they were not absolute monarchs. Sir John Fortescue describes the kingdom a *dominium politicum et regale;* that is, a limited monarchy, and that of France a *dominium regale*, or an absolute monarchy. The difference between these two kinds of kingdoms is thus defined by him, that whereas an absolute monarch may rule his people by his own laws, and may tax them without their consent, a limited monarch could only rule his subjects by laws to which they had assented, and raise taxes which they had imposed upon themselves. The same authority says, that a king of England could not at his own pleasure make any alterations in the laws of the land, inasmuch as the nature of his government was not only regal but political. But although they could neither make, repeal, nor amend the laws, it is certain that the crown had a dispensing power; that is, the power of suspending statutes when the king was adverse to their enactments. Many instances are on record in which they took upon themselves to dispense with laws, and granted permission to particular persons or societies to violate them with impunity. Perhaps the most extraordinary instance is furnished by the use Edward IV. made of this dispensing power in the second year of his reign; when to secure the clergy in his interest he granted them permission to violate all the laws of the land, moral and political, and forbade his judges and officers to punish them for their crimes. As regards the prerogatives of the Plantagenet monarchs, they were but the show of those which had been possessed by the first kings of England after the Conquest. They still retained some which were distasteful to their subjects, such as the wardships and marriages of the tenants of the crown, purveyances, and others; but owing to their greater dependence on their people, these prerogatives were exercised with much greater lenity than they had been in former times. In exercising that of purveyance, they could not take what they required for their household arbitrarily, but what they took was to be assessed by proper officers, and either paid for at the time, or on a day fixed by the great officers of the household. Among other minor prerogatives of the Plantagenet kings was the right of pressing not only sailors and soldiers into their service, but also artificers of every kind, and even musicians, goldsmiths, and embroiderers.

On the whole, though the constitution, government, and laws of England had not yet arrived at that excellence to which they have since attained, they were considerably improved in this period. And if we take into consideration the fierce wars which raged almost from the beginning to the end of the period—wars with France and Scotland, and wars between the rival houses of York and Lancaster in the heart of the kingdom—this must be considered very remarkable. Even during the wars of the Roses, the government on the whole seems to have been well administered, especially as compared with those of any other state in Europe at that time. On this subject, an acute writer remarks:—"During this troubled time, when we might naturally expect that the whole framework of society would be thrown into disorder, we find the internal administration of England proceeding with the same regularity as if the struggle for supremacy was raging on the banks of the Seine instead of the banks of the Thames. The uniform course of justice is uninterrupted. Men are litigating for disputed rights, as if there were no general peril of property. They are electing knights of the shires and burgesses, under aristocratical or popular influences, as if the real arbitrement of these contentions was to be in the parliament house and not in the battle-field. They are buying and selling, growing and importing, as if the producers looked on with indifference, whilst the Warwicks and Somersets were slaying or being slain. They wear richer apparel, and strive more for outward distinctions, and build better houses than when their fathers were fighting in France; and they are really prospering in an increase of material wealth, though they greatly lack the instrument of exchange, for the want of money is grievously felt from the peer to the huckster. They pursue their accustomed diversions; they hunt and they hawk; they gamble in public gardens; they gape at the players of interludes; they go on pilgrimage to Canterbury, and Walsingham, and St. Jago

—they take life easily, as if no danger were around them, when truly they might be in trouble for shouting for the White Rose on one day, and for the Red on the next. Their marriages go forward with the keenest avidity amongst the gentry and the burgesses to make the best bargains for their sons and daughters, and whilst we know how many great houses were rendered desolate by these troubles, we have no satisfactory evidence that during their existence population had decreased." According to Philip de Comines, one of the most accomplished statesmen of his age, the calamities of the wars of the Roses fell only upon their authors; for he says:—"England has this peculiar grace, that neither the country, nor the people, nor the houses are wasted, destroyed, or demolished; but the calamities and misfortunes of the war fall only upon the soldiers, and especially the nobility."

SECTION II.

At the commencement of this period the government of Scotland was in an unsettled state. For the first twenty-four years it was governed by regents, who made no new laws, and had no authority to execute those which were in existence. According to Sir John Fortescue, the government was a constitutional and not an absolute monarchy, but his testimony more especially refers to the period when James I. had been released from his captivity in England, and was seated on his throne; for he says, "the king of Scots reigneth over his people by this law; to wit, *regimine politico et regali*." On his return, James found his kingdom in the utmost disorder. The laws were despised, the royal authority almost extinct, the revenues of the crown dissipated, the arts and commerce in a languishing conditition, his nobles factious and turbulent, and the people indigent and oppressed. He had a great work to perform—to bring order out of chaos. But he was equal to the task. While in England he had learnt much as regards the art of governing. One of his first objects appears to have been to model his parliament as far as possible after that of the country in which he had been in exile. In the previous century, burgesses, or representatives of burghs, had sat in the Scottish parliament, but the first mention of representatives of counties occurs in the year 1428, four years after his return from England. An Act passed in that year ordained that the small barons and free tenants need not come to the parliament, provided that each sheriffdom sent two or more wise men as their representatives, except those of Clackmannan and Kinross, which were to send each one member only. But this Act appears rather to have been permissive than compulsory, and it does not appear clear that it was carried into effect till the next century, when it was re-enacted.

The first parliament of James I. met on the 26th of May, 1424, and in this and subsequent parliaments many Acts were passed to remedy the evils above enumerated. For restoring the authority of the laws, it was enacted that all the king's lieges should be governed by them; that six wise men and discreet, versed in the laws, should be chosen out of the three estates to examine the books of the law and amend what needed correction; that they should be duly promulgated throughout the country, that no one might plead ignorance of them; and that officers and ministers of the law should be appointed throughout the realm to put them into execution. For reviving the king's prerogatives, laws of great severity were enacted against treason, and all who aided or entertained traitors; against bonds or combinations for resisting the king and his officers in the administration of justice and execution of the laws; against private war; and against spreading evil reports of the government with a design of disturbing the public peace and creating discord between the king and his subjects. For recovering the patrimony and revenues of the crown, the first parliament of James granted him the greater customs on all goods exported and imported; and appointed commissioners to search out what lands had belonged to the three preceding kings, that such as had been alienated by the regents might be resumed.

In that first parliament of James I., mention is first made of a singular institution, called the "Lords of the Articles." These lords were a committee of parliament chosen by each of the three estates—the clergy, the barons, and the burgesses—to which the king added as many nominees as he pleased. This committee appears from first to last—and it continued down to the dissolution of the union—to have been a mere instrument in the hands of the crown. Eventually, if not from the date of their institution, the "lords of the articles" had great power, for they assumed the absolute right of determining what bills should be introduced into parliament, and what subject of debate should be brought forward. A parliament thus subjected to control could never be regarded as either a popular representation or a council of the aristocracy, but only of the king to do his bidding, through the medium of the lords of the articles, both as regards taxation and acts of legislation; for as the king might nominate as many of these lords as he pleased, it may safely be concluded that he was the controlling power over them as they were over the parliament.

An insight is given into the condition of the lower orders in Scotland, when James returned from England, by a law which was enacted for the regulation of beggars, and the punishment of "forners." Beggars abounded throughout the country; and it was enacted that, if any one above the age of fourteen and under seventy presumed to beg in boroughs without badges from the magistrates, or in the country without badges from the sheriffs, they should be seized and compelled to labour, under the penalty of being burnt on the cheek and banished the kingdom. Forners were lawless banditti, who roamed about the country in troops, living at free quarters wherever they went, by which the industrious community greatly suffered. On these James lay a heavier hand than on the beggars. Sheriffs were empowered to search them out, and when found, to apprehend, imprison, and punish them with the utmost rigour. But this evil was found difficult to remedy, for in such a country as Scotland was at that age, thinly populated and wild in mountain and moor, these forners defied the power which sought to restrain them. Notwithstanding, during the thirteen years James reigned, he did much

to restore the authority of law, to provide for the administration of justice, and to protect his subjects from the evils to which they had been exposed. Had his career not been cut short by the hands of assassins, it seems likely that in a few years Scotland would have become one of the best regulated governments in Europe.

Some reforms were made in the constitution of Scotland by his son and successor, James II.; but compared with his illustrious father, James II. was a feeble monarch. For the most part he was the tool of faction. This is clear from the severe Acts made for securing his person and authority, and for punishing those who attempted anything against them, or favoured such attempts. Thus, by the clause of one of these Acts, it was enacted that those who assailed castles or places where the king happened to be, without the consent of the three estates, they should be punished as traitors; from which it is plain that the three estates supposed a case might occur when it would be proper for them to command a castle in which the king might be assaulted; and the case they had in view was probably this: when the king had been seized by some powerful faction against his will, as in these turbulent times frequently happened. It was, perhaps, to prevent this, as well as to add to the revenues of the crown, that a remarkable law was made in 1455, annexing many castles and lordships to the crown, and declaring them unalienable without the consent of the three estates in parliament. The reason given for the passing of this Act was, that the poverty of the crown was often the cause of the poverty of the realm; but there was an evident intention, by this Act, to render the more powerful factions powerless to harm the king or his authority. But all efforts made to reduce the power of faction was useless, for it still prevailed; and this is the cause why, in the unhappy reign of James III., but few laws were made for the improvement of the constitution.

The prerogatives of the kings of Scotland in this period resembled those of the kings of England; but they were seldom able to exercise them. They stood more in awe of the nobles than did the contemporary sovereigns of England. In some parts of their dominions, and especially in the highlands, their authority was often defied and their laws disregarded. This was chiefly owing to their long and frequent minorities: the crown always losing power when it was placed on the head of a minor. According to the records and printed statutes of the period, their parliaments were often consulted on matters which undoubtedly belonged to their own prerogative. Thus it would appear that they consulted their parliaments as to whether they should make war, and when made, as to whether they should conclude a peace or truce. The Scottish parliaments were also consulted as to the granting of pardons, coining money, and sending ambassadors to foreign courts. But as the Lords of the Articles overawed the parliaments, after all the Scottish kings may have exercised their prerogatives to a greater extent than is imagined; choosing rather to exercise it through these from prudential considerations, than in *propria personâ*.

A Scottish parliament was composed of three different orders in society, which were called "the three estates;" the first consisting of the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, and a few other dignitaries of the church; the second of dukes, earls, barons, lords of parliament, and freeholders; and the third of representatives of boroughs. The two first of these estates greatly preponderated, both in numbers and influence. It might almost be said that the parliaments consisted of temporal and spiritual lords, inasmuch as they were but thinly attended with the smaller barons and freeholders and the representatives of boroughs. That the temporal and spiritual lords were considered to be the staple of these assemblies is evidenced by the fact that they were summoned by the king by special letters under his signet, whereas all the other members were summoned by general precepts issued out of chancery, which were published in the form of edicts by the sheriffs of the shires. On the opening of parliament, no mention is made in any record of any speech being made either by the king or any of his ministers, though it is probable that some intimation was given to the members as to the reason why they were called together. At the first meeting of every session the names of all who were bound to appear were called over, and the ancient records tend to prove that the summons was frequently ill obeyed, for they read thus: "that all who were able and willing to come were present; that some who were absent had sent excuses; that others were absent without cause;" and that each of these last was fined two pounds for his contumacy. At the close of this period a practice commenced which was continued down to the Union, of recording the names of all who were present, from which time, probably, a better attendance of the lower members was secured. But as before shown, the real power in these Scottish parliaments was in the hands of the Lords of the Articles; for although there were two independent committees formed on the first day of sitting, one of which sat as judges in all criminal prosecutions that were brought before parliament, and the other as judges in all civil causes that were brought into parliament, by appeals from the inferior courts, yet as a seat and vote was by law given in each of these committees to all the Lords of the Articles who chose to claim them, the whole power was thrown into the hands of that more aristocratical section of parliament.

The chief courts of law in Scotland were not like those of England, fixed to one place, but were ambulatory—being sometimes held in one place and sometimes in another. It is true the committees on judgments and causes were in reality courts of law, and the highest courts of the kingdom; but *their* place of sitting was not always the same, for the parliaments of Scotland, of which they were members, and during the sessions of which only they acted, as previous pages testify, were sometimes held at Edinburgh, and sometimes in other places. Another high court of law was called the "Session," but this court had no stated establishment. It was constituted by parliament as occasion required—that assembly naming the judges, and appointing the time, places, and durations of its sittings. Judges of the session were always nine in number—three prelates, three barons, and three burgesses. The office was purely honorary, for they had neither salaries nor perquisites allowed

them for the performance of their duties. Most commonly this court was appointed for one year, during which period the judges sat at different places at different times of the year. Thus, by the appointment of the parliament held at Edinburgh, A.D. 1457, there were three sessions held that year; one at Edinburgh, one at Perth, and one at Aberdeen, each of which continued forty days. But the constitution of this court underwent various changes in this period, so that it cannot be defined with accuracy.

During this period the head of the law in Scotland was the justiciary-general. This great officer was the chief dispenser of justice, and either in person or by his deputies dispensed justice twice a year—in the spring and autumn—in every county in the kingdom. His courts were called justice-airs, and when held, the sheriff with all the barons and freeholders of the county were obliged to attend them. Another great officer of the law was the chamberlain, whose jurisdiction was chiefly, if not wholly, confined to the royal boroughs of the kingdom. His courts were called chamberlain-airs, and the magistrates, as well as the inhabitants of boroughs, were amenable to them. It was the chamberlain's duty to adjudicate on all complaints of the people against their magistrates, or of the magistrates against the people, or of one burgess against another. Other duties of the chamberlain were to collect the revenues, regulate weights and measures, remove nuisances, and to take cognisance of everything respecting the police of the borough in which the court was held. Appeals against the decisions of the chamberlain were not made either to the justiciary-general or to the king in council, or even to the parliament, but to a singular tribunal called the "court of the four boroughs." Anciently, the four boroughs which composed this supreme court over that of the chamberlain were Edinburgh, Stirling, Berwick, and Roxburgh; but when these two last fell into the hands of the English, Lanark and Linlithgow were substituted in their places. Each of these four boroughs were compelled, when called upon, to send three or four burgesses, having lawful commission to appear before the chamberlain at Haddington, to discuss and determine on the right or the wrong of the complaints made against their sentences—their decisions being as final as if they had been given to the high court of parliament. It is probable that this remarkable institution was established because it was believed that burgesses were the best judges of all disputes that arose among burghers.

Anterior to this period, the kings of Scotland had not only diminished the patrimony of the crown by extensive grants of land, but by imprudent grants of various powers, privileges, and jurisdictions. Like the kings of England, they had their favourites, who, by their injudicious favours, they raised to a position which rendered them almost independent of the crown. Such was especially the case with the lords of regalities. Their exceptions, powers, and privileges were such as to make them petty kings, and their territories petty kingdoms. They acted as kings. They had their officers of state, their judges, and their courts. In their courts delinquents were tried and punished; and when they pleased, they extended their mercy to the greatest criminals. These were some of the evils which the kings of this period sought to remedy. James I. obtained several acts of parliament to compel lords of regalities and their officers to execute the laws, and to enable him to punish them if they refused; and his son and successor, James II., procured laws by which no further regalities were to be granted without the consent of parliament, and no office for the future was to be given in fee and heritage. But all their efforts were fruitless. For about three centuries after these laws were made, the hereditary powers and jurisdictions of barons and lords of regality formed an integral part of the constitution of Scotland.

CHAPTER III.

The History of Religion, from A.D. 1399 to A.D. 1485.

At the close of the last period a great struggle between the advocates of light and darkness had commenced. The great reformer, Wycliffe, had struck a heavy blow, by his preaching and by his writings, against the errors of the church of Rome. Nobles, knights, and people had been led by him to see that the Romish priesthood were "blind leaders of the blind." Thus, in one of his homilies he declared that "he had great comfort of certain knights that they favoured the gospel and were disposed to read it in English." Of these, several have been mentioned by the chroniclers, together with dukes and earls, who, as these chroniclers represent, "having a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, surrounded the false preachers with a military band, that they might not suffer reproaches or losses by the orthodox, on account of their profane doctrine." As seen in a previous page, Wycliffe's doctrines were condemned by the hierarchy, and his person endangered by their promulgation; but having supporters among the nobility, he escaped the vengeance of his enemies, and died peacefully in his bed.

After the death of Wycliffe, the mighty waters which he had sent forth to cleanse the land continued to flow onward. The stream became more and more impetuous in its course, until at length "deep" began to "call on deep" with a voice so fearful that the Church called loudly and passionately for the assistance of the State in arresting the progress of the deluge. Something was done in the reign of Richard II. to stem it, but it was all in vain—it still flowed onward. Pope Boniface IX. called upon the Church to root out and destroy the maintenances of doctrines subversive of the State, both civil and ecclesiastical, and exhorted Richard to strengthen the hands of the

clergy with all the aids of the secular power and authority. But this call of Boniface had not much effect. The hierarchy condemned the reformers' doctrines in council and by their writings; and some of those nobles and knights who had favoured them, awed by Richard's rebukes and menaces, abjured their principles; but the mass who had imbibed them still remained faithful. The truth is, the king and the clergy were not one in the matter. They were zealous, but he was lukewarm. It is, perhaps, from this cause more than any other that the clergy became disaffected towards his rule; for "the only instance in English history wherein their conduct as a body was disloyal," is found in the part which they took in his deposition.

But more promising times for the hierarchy was at hand. As they had helped to put down one king, so they assisted in raising up another. Nay, the clergy were the chief instruments in placing the usurper, Henry IV., on the throne of England. He was deeply indebted to their influence for the crown, and it was a natural consequence that they should expect him to do something for them. "The Church was in danger!" Such was the cry which the hierarchy rung in Henry's ears, and, as all history testifies, such a cry was in these dark ages sure to bring down vengeance on the heads of those by whom it was assailed. True, in the reign of Richard it was half unheeded; but his lukewarmness was to a considerable extent the cause of his downfall. Both he and the clergy had carried on the conflict with the enemies of the Church with blunted weapons, but the clergy had grown weary of such a warfare. Unwarned by the records of ancient history, which history, with a trumpet-tongue, taught that the blood of martyrs was the seed of the true Christian Church, they longed to be armed with the sword of persecution. And by the usurper, Henry, they were soon armed with that sword. In the last year of the reign of Richard II., archbishop Arundel, who of all the hierarchy had been the most bitter enemy of those who had embraced the doctrines of Wycliffe, had been banished for his disloyalty; but he had come back again in the train of Henry of Bolingbroke. Such an event was ominous.

Placed at the head of the Church, and supported by all the power of the crown, Arundel was determined to show the followers of Wycliffe no mercy. He had ample encouragement to proceed in his design. Conscious of the defects of his title, on his ascending the throne, Henry earnestly sought the favour and support of the clergy. On the 6th of October, A.D. 1399, six days only after he began to reign, there was a convocation of the province of Canterbury in the chapter-house of St. Paul's, and thither came the earl of Northumberland with this pleasing message:—"I am not come," said the earl, "like the commissioners of former kings, to demand your money, but to assure you that my royal master never will demand any money of his clergy, except in cases of the most extreme necessity. I am come most earnestly to beg the prayers of the Church for the king and kingdom, and to promise that he will protect the clergy in all their liberties and immunities; and that he will assist them with all his power in exterminating heretics." Moreover, at his coronation Henry was anointed with oil said to have been given by the Virgin Mary to Thomas à Becket with this two-fold prediction: that whatever king received unction therefrom, that king would be kind to his subjects, and, above all, a champion of the Church. Arundel, therefore, had ample encouragement, that however murderous his designs might be against heretics, he should find a willing instrument in Henry to carry out his design.

No time was lost. To his everlasting dishonour, at the request of Arundel and the clergy, in the first year of his reign, Henry consented to light up the flames of religious persecution in the land, by passing that execrable law for the burning of heretics alive, which was the disgrace of our statute-book for more than two centuries. On this subject Le Bas observes: "It is, perhaps, scarcely too much to say that by that brutal enactment which converted kings into slaves and butchers of the Church, the doom of the papacy in England was sealed. It had a long respite, but nevertheless it was its death warrant. It may be frankly allowed that the clergy had considerable cause for complaint. The abuse heaped upon them by the Lollards was not only furious but indiscriminate; and besides, the Reformers would probably have suffered little to remain untouched, if they had been left entirely to their own impulses. Cathedrals, abbeys, and monasteries might have fallen before them; all endowments might have been swept away: and there was no inconsiderable danger lest piety itself should have been rendered almost hateful by the unsocial austerity which was beginning to furrow the countenance and to cloud the brow of their religion. In addition to this, it can scarcely be denied that the whole fabric of society was in some hazard from their principles. There is reason to believe that by many of them the reign of the saints upon earth was eagerly anticipated; and that their impatience, if not effectually curbed, might have broken out into wild and fearful commotion. Under these circumstances, if the Church and State had combined to repress by vigorous laws such manifestations of opinion as threatened the peace and stability of the empire, they would have done nothing which could reasonably meet the censures of the most enlightened age. Instead of this, the hierarchy preferred dealing with the innovators rather as heretics than as traitors and incendiaries; and not only so, but they fixed upon the most absurd of all the Romish dogmas as the test of heresy. The murderous question by which they brought their inquisitions to an issue was always, 'Do you or do you not believe that material bread remains in the Sacrament after the words of consecration have been uttered?' If the answer was in the affirmative, nothing remained for the delinquent but a death of excruciating anguish. The immediate effect of such proceedings was that the Lollards were regarded not as suffering the penalty due to revolutionary opinions and practices, but as martyrs in the cause of scriptural truth. The more remote consequences were, that a sentiment of abhorrence was gradually imbibed against the clergy, as monsters of inhumanity and injustice. And under the force of these convictions the Romish establishments eventually sunk into the dust."

That the Lollards were declared opponents of the established Church and of the Romish hierarchy there

can be no question. They were as truly Reformers and Protestants in this century as Luther and his followers were in the next. Their views of faith and doctrine may not have been so clear, but at the same time they were in the main founded on Scripture. What their creed was may be gathered from a petition which they presented to the house of commons, A.D. 1395. In that petition they maintained that the possession of temporalities by the clergy was contrary to the law of Christianity and obstructive of faith, hope, and charity. The Romish priesthood they asserted was not established by Christ. They held that the outward rites of worship were not warranted in Scripture; that the celibacy of the clergy occasioned scandalous irregularities in the Church; that the pretended miracle of transubstantiation had a tendency to make the people idolators; that exorcisms over bread, wine, oil, water, and salt, savoured of necromancy rather than religion; that the clergy, by holding secular offices under the government, were attempting the impossible service of serving both God and Mammon; that prayers for the dead were unacceptable to the Almighty, because in many cases they were offered for persons, such as founders of monasteries and other pernicious endowments, who were out of the reach of mercy; that pilgrimages and prayers made to images were allied to idolatry; that auricular confession was mischievous in practice; that priests had no power to absolve the people from their sins; that the taking away of life, either in war or by a judicial tribunal, was contrary to the benign spirit of Christianity; and that certain trades, such as those of the goldsmith and sword-cutler, although they had been allowed under the Mosaic dispensation, were not lawful under that of the New Testament, and therefore as they were the occasion of sin, they ought to be put down by the strong arm of the law. Some of these positions were untenable; but the petitioners supported them by the authority of Scripture and acute human reasoning, and professed, like amiable enthusiasts as they were, to deliver their testimony by virtue of a commission from the Almighty. Their creed was certainly one that struck at the very root of the faith and doctrines of the Romish Church, and was, therefore, well calculated to bring down the vengeance of the hierarchy on their devoted heads.

The first victim was William Sautré, parish priest of St. Osyth, in the city of London. While yet that parliament was sitting which passed the detestable law against heresy, Arundel, impatient to begin his bloody work, brought him to trial for heresy before the convocation of the province of Canterbury at St. Paul's. He was charged with eight articles of heresy; but the two on which the greatest stress was laid were, that he refused to worship the cross and denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. At first, Sautré wavered in his faith, the fear of death made him half a coward. In order to avoid it, he endeavoured to explain away his so-called heresies. He offered to pay an inferior vicarious kind of worship to the cross on account of him who died upon it; but that was not sufficient. He acknowledged the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament; and that after the words of consecration were pronounced, the bread became the true spiritual bread of life. But that gave no satisfaction. He was to profess that his belief was this: "That after consecration the substance of the bread and wine no longer remained, but was converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, which were as really and truly in their proper substance and nature in the Sacrament as they were in the womb of the Virgin Mary—as they hung upon the cross—as they lay in the grave—and as they now resided in heaven." But this doctrine was too monstrous for the accused to believe. His courage revived. Whatever might be the consequence, he boldly declared that he could neither understand nor believe it. His fate was sealed. The archbishop pronounced him an obstinate heretic, degraded him from all the clerical orders with which he had been invested, and delivered him over to the mayor and sheriff of London. They were to use him kindly, he said, although the prelatical hypocrite knew that all the kindness they dared show him was to burn him to ashes. He was burnt in Smithfield, and William Sautré may justly be styled the proto-martyr of England. Lingard, that great apologist of the Romish Church, says that having "refused to give any satisfaction on the subject of the Eucharist, he was convicted as a heretic;" adding that "the unhappy man, instead of being shut up in an asylum for lunatics, was burnt to death as a malefactor in the presence of an immense multitude." It might be imagined from this fallacious sentence that the judges on this occasion were forgetful of their ordinary gentleness, and that by a strain of unusual severity an unfortunate maniac was punished as a criminal. But Lingard must have known that the martyr was no more mad than St. Paul was when accused of madness before the "most noble Festus." When he penned that sentence by which he sought to justify the black crime thus committed to the Church, he knew that the victim was sacrificed according to a law dictated by that Church, and which was impatient to condemn all similar malefactors.

This first holocaust offered up on the altar of the mass had its effect upon the followers of Wycliffe. Many were not prepared to offer up their lives in testimony of the truth as it is in Jesus. To save life, which is dear to all men, numbers concealed their opinions, while others when brought to trial, fainted, and wounded their consciences by pretending to renounce their sentiments. Several years elapsed before any one was found possessed of sufficient fortitude to endure the fiery trial. But there was one who, for his sufferings in the cause of truth, deserves honourable mention in the page of religious history—William Thorpe.

Thorpe, whose character and life as a "poor priest" reflected signal credit on the cause to which he devoted himself. He was destined by his parents for the sacerdotal office, and no expense was spared by them in fitting him for it. On arriving at the proper age for entering upon it, however, he hesitated at taking upon himself the sacred responsibility. But on consulting several wise and virtuous priests, among whom were Nicholas Hereford and Philip Repingdon, who subsequently from fear of death returned to the "old faith," he resolved to join them in their pious labours. Thorpe sought the truth at the lips of John Wycliffe himself, and captivated with his teaching

and character, he devoted himself to the work of preaching the doctrines of that Reformer. For thirty years he spread the precious knowledge he had attained through various parts of the kingdom, and especially in the northern counties. Such a preacher could not hope to escape persecution. He was several times interrupted in his labours by imprisonment, but by his own prudence and favourable events, he escaped down to the year 1407 any further sufferings. But in that year the hand of ecclesiastical discipline fell upon him. He was arrested by the magistrates of Shrewsbury and sent to archbishop Arundel, before whom, with three of the most learned clergy, he underwent a long examination. From his own account of this examination, which is preserved in Fox's 'Book of Martyrs,' it appears that he was more than a match for his antagonists in argument. Nor was he awed by their menaces; or seduced, as too many were, by their promises. Others had obtained preferments by recanting: he sternly refused to be thus tempted from the path of duty. Arundel, who was a profane swearer, declared with many oaths that "he would pursue him and all his sect so narrowly that he would not leave one slip in the land," and one of his assistant-priests told him, if he did not recant, he should "be cursed, degraded, burnt, and damned;" but still he maintained his cause with inflexible constancy. It is singular that such a "poor priest" should have escaped being burnt at the stake; but probably his death was far more horrible, for he was committed to a loathsome prison at Saltwood, the horrors of which had overcome the fortitude of several other Lollards, and it is probable that he died there, as no further mention is made in history of this truly worthy confessor.

Meanwhile some attempts had been made by the peers and the commons against the patrimonies of the Church. In the year 1403, when Henry IV., who was reduced to great straits in his expedition into Wales, the barons proposed to seize the money and plate of certain rich prelates who were in the army to supply his wants; and in the next year, when a supply was demanded from the commons, they sought to lay hands on some of their superfluous riches; but Arundel had sufficient influence with the king to prevent the "sacrilege." Falling on his knees before him, he conjured Henry to respect his coronation oath, by which he had solemnly sworn to protect the Church in all her privileges and immunities; and he was sent away with the king's most solemn assurance that he would defend them, and that he would leave the Church richer at his death than when he ascended the throne. These attempts were renewed by the commons in the year 1409, by presenting a petition to the king, praying that he would be pleased to take away the estates of the bishops, abbots, and priors, which they spent in pomp and luxury, and representing that both the crown and kingdom would reap great advantages therefrom; but on this occasion the peers presented a counter-petition, praying the king to protect the patrimony of the Church, and to punish all those who taught that it was lawful to take it away, and this renewed attempt proved abortive. At the same time, during this reign, subservient as Henry was to the clergy, several laws were passed against the exactions of the court of Rome, against the Pope's providing successors to benefices before they became vacant, and against his granting exemptions to the regular clergy from the payment of tithes, which, although these laws proved a dead letter, show that there was a spirit abroad inimical to the power and wealth of the Church, and to the high pretensions of the sovereign pontiff.

It seems clear that the attempts made by the commons, many of whom were Lollards in heart, to restrain the power and diminish the wealth of the clergy, had the effect of increasing the exasperation of archbishop Arundel against the so-called "heretics." In January, A.D. 1409, he held a convocation of the prelates and clergy of his province in which thirteen canons or constitutions were made, all of which had for their object the extirpation of Lollardism. In the preface to these canons it was declared to be the most horrid of all crimes to dispute any of the doctrines, or disobey any of the decrees promulgated by the Pope. He, it was asserted, carried the keys of eternal life and eternal death—was the vice regent not of a man but God, to whom had been committed the government of the kingdom of heaven. At any period of the history of the Popes, this language would have been most strangely discordant with their characters, but at this time it was peculiarly inappropriate. There was a schism in the papacy. There were two Popes, each of whom had sent the other down to the bottomless pit, and both of whom were thus every year declared contumacious heretics by the council of Pisa. Which of these two Popes—Peter de Luna, called Benedict XIII., or Angelus Corarius, called Gregory XII.—was considered by Arundel to be God's vice-regent on earth, it would be difficult to say: especially as, when the council of Pisa deposed them, they raised Peter Philaret, a Greek, to the papacy, under the name of Alexander V., who was acknowledged, after his election in June, as Pope by the Church of England. But Arundel, by promulgating this most impudent dogma, conceived no doubt that it would strengthen his hands in the work of persecution; for the constitutions now published were preliminary to further efforts to extirpate Lollardism, by inflicting certain wholesome severities on those who propagated or professed those doctrines.

This time the vengeance of the Church fell upon one in the humble walks of life. The second victim was one John Badby, who, in some accounts, is called a tailor, and in others, a smith. It is a matter of small moment whether this poor man worked on a tailor's board or at the smith's forge, it is sufficient to know that the faith he professed was so well known as to entitle him to the dignity of martyrdom. Badby was arrested in the diocese of Worcester by the bishop of that see, for the primate had his satellites in the holy work of crushing heresy, and tried and found guilty of holding and maintaining doctrines contrary to those of holy mother Church. But it does not appear that the bishop had the power of putting the humble tailor or smith to death: that work was left for the primate to perform; and hard and callous must have been that primate's heart which could have been so indifferent to all humane feelings as to cause his lips to pronounce the sentence of death

against him. He surely could not have been dangerous to the prosperity of the Church. He surely could not have had the remotest idea that he could have lowered it in the estimation of the people. True "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump;" but all he could have done was to teach perchance his wife and children and a few near neighbours the truths which he had himself been taught by William Thorpe, or some other of Wycliffe's "poor priests." But no matter: he had imbibed those doctrines, and he must swell the holocaust offered up on the altar of the mass. He was sent by the bishop of Worcester with a copy of his trial and sentence to the primate. The heresy of which he stood accused was this: "That the Sacrament of the body of Christ, consecrated by the priest on the altar, was not the true body of Christ by virtue of the words of the Sacrament; but that after the Sacramental words spoken by the priest to make the body of Christ the material bread did remain upon the altar as at the beginning; neither was it turned into the very body of Christ after the Sacramental words spoken by the priest." He stood also accused of saying that no priest was able to make the body of Christ. Most rational and scriptural were the opinions held on those vital subjects by John Badby. But the Church held them to be errors, and he was called upon to recant. One cannot sufficiently admire the fortitude of this poor tailor or smith of Worcester. He stood in the presence of the primate, nine prelates, and many of the nobility, and yet in his examination he stood firm to his opinions. As he had held them in his own native village so he cleaved to them before that noble but bloodthirsty assembly. It was in vain that the primate urged him to renounce his errors and believe as the Church believed. If he did so, he said "he would gage his soul for him at the Day of Judgment;" but Badby would not take such a guarantee for his soul's eternal safety. He still adhered to his opinions, and he was pronounced an obstinate heretic and delivered over to the tender mercies of the secular magistrates. He was on that very day conducted to Smithfield to die. As he stood fastened to a stake with iron chains, with the wood piled around him, the Prince of Wales appeared on the scene, and entreated him to save himself by renouncing his heresies, and promising him a competent income for life if he would comply. But, no! He believed, he said, that his opinions were true, and he could not renounce them even to save his life. The fire was kindled, and in his agony he cried for mercy. Conceiving that his fortitude was overcome, the prince commanded the flames to be extinguished, and renewed his entreaties to him to recant: but he would have no mercy at the price of his soul. He remained invincible in his resolution to endure any torments rather than renounce the truth, and the fire was rekindled, and the body of this humble yet glorious martyr was reduced to ashes.

It was not by the fire only, nor by inducements held out for the Lollards to recant, that Arundel sought to repress the doctrines of Wycliffe. While those dreaded writings of the Reformer remained uncondemned, he could not hope to root out Lollardie from the land; especially as the doctrines taught in them had taken deep root in the minds of many scholars and students in the University of Oxford. Accordingly, in the year 1411, in order to suppress those doctrines, Arundel sat out with a great retinue to visit that University. But he was not wanted at Oxford. He was not popular at that seat of learning. As he approached the city he was met by the chancellor and proctors, who informed him that if he came only to view their colleges, he should be received with the respect due to his rank; but that if he came as their visitor, he could not be admitted, as the university was exempted by several bulls from all episcopal visitations. Irritated at this repulse, Arundel appealed to the king, who, after hearing both parties, in the year 1412, decided against the university. Nevertheless, the primate did not execute his intended visitation, but contented himself with commanding twelve of the most learned and orthodox members of the university to examine the writings of Wycliffe, and extract therefrom such opinions as appeared to them heretical and erroneous. That command was obeyed, and two hundred and sixty-seven opinions were transmitted to him as partly heretical and partly erroneous. At that time Balthaser Cossa, a Neapolitan, who assumed the name of John XXII., was Pope, and Arundel sent these opinions to him, with a request to condemn them, and grant him

BURNING AT SMITHFIELD.

authority to exhume the body of Wycliffe, and throw it on a dunghill that it might be trampled on by all Christians. John, who was himself three years afterwards, A.D. 1415, deposed for heresy and crimes of the deepest dye, readily condemned Wycliffe's doctrines, but refused to gratify the primate's malice by granting him permission to disturb his ashes. As for the condemnation of Wycliffe's doctrines, it was impotent to suppress them, for they daily took deeper root in the popular mind.

Such were the leading features of Arundel's attempts to suppress Lollardie, as it was called, in the reign of Henry IV. The accession of Henry V., A.D. 1413, brought no cessation to his activity nor diminution to his power. At that time greater efforts were needed if he hoped to succeed in his crusade against the Lollards. Henry V. was possessed of a generous disposition, but he was as insensible to human suffering as the sternest soldier in the field of battle. His conduct in the case of the martyr Badby well illustrates his character. His generous nature would have spared him if he had recanted, but he had no compunction at seeing him roasted alive when he found that he stood firm in his belief. Moreover, Henry V., like his father, in order to secure his throne, found that it was imperative upon him to conciliate the clergy, and to stand forward as a dutiful son of the Church and a zealous defender of the faith. In him, therefore, Arundel found a willing coadjutor in the work of persecution; and that work was now carried on with tenfold vigour. One of the most illustrious victims was Sir John Oldcastle, otherwise Lord Cobham. Oldcastle, whose history and fate has been recorded in a previous page, was a friend of Henry V.; but such was his abhorrence of heresy that even he was eventually delivered over to the tender mercies of prelatical bigotry. But to secure his death something more than a charge of heresy was needed in order to induce Henry to give his consent to it. He was accused by his enemies of disloyalty and treasonable designs. Walsingham affirms that the Lollards, at the commencement of the reign of Henry, fixed placards to the doors of the London churches proclaiming that a hundred thousand strong arms were in readiness to enforce their opinions; and that they were instigated to these outrages by Sir John Oldcastle. The history of the transactions in which he is said to have been implicated is replete with perplexities; but it appears certain that the grave charges laid against him were most unfounded, and that when he really did appear in arms, it was in self-defence. As regards the account of the plot which Walsingham affirms to have existed, it has been justly remarked by Turner that "it is all a series of surmise and rumour, alarm and anticipation. That any plot was formed there is no evidence; and the probability is that artful measures were taken to alarm the mind of the king into anger and cruelty by charges of treason and rebellion, and meditated assassination." That the Lollards, as a body, contemplated appealing to the sword in their quarrel with Church and State is most improbable, since, as before recorded, one essential feature of their creed was, that to take away the life of man in war was expressly contrary to the spirit and the precepts of Christianity.

Lord Cobham was condemned to die for his heretical opinions in the first year of Henry's reign, but he did not suffer martyrdom till the year 1418, having in the interval escaped from the Tower, and undergone many vicissitudes and trials. In the meantime, that arch persecutor of the Lollards, the primate Arundel, had gone to his account. He was succeeded in the primacy by Henry Chicheley, who was elected by the monks of Canterbury on the king's recommendation. The schism in the papacy still continued. Pope John was contending with two anti-Popes, but notwithstanding this, he disannulled the election of Chicheley as an encroachment on the right of nomination. But fearing to withstand the wishes of Henry and the Church of England, John subsequently nominated Chicheley himself; and on receiving his pall from the Pope, the primate took an oath of canonical obedience in terms that rendered him more the subject of that pontiff than of his sovereign.

This change in the primacy brought no relief to the Lollards. Chicheley, indeed, seems to have proceeded against them in a more exterminating spirit than Arundel. It was probably through his influence that a very severe law was passed against them in a parliament which met at Leicester, A.D. 1415. By that law all former statutes against them were confirmed, and it was further enacted, "That the chancellor, the judges of both benches and of assize, all justices of the peace, sheriffs, mayors, and bailiffs, should take an oath at their admission to their offices to do everything in their power to extirpate all Lollards out of the kingdom, and to assist the ordinaries in prosecuting them." But to obtain this law gross misrepresentations were made concerning the new sect. The preamble to this statute affirms that "great rumours, congregations, and insurrections, had been raised in the realm of England by divers high subjects of the king, as well by those who belonged to the heretical sect called Lollardie as by others of their confederacy, excitation, and abatement, with a view to annul and subvert the Christian faith and the law of God in this kingdom; also to destroy our sovereign lord the king himself, and all manner of estates of this realm, as well spiritual as temporal; and, moreover, all manner of policy, and, finally, all the laws of the land." That the Lollards ever contemplated the dissolution of the whole fabric of society as this recital asserts is altogether unfounded. The records of their persecution prove this, for they are wholly silent on the subject of sedition or conspiracy. The crime for which they suffered was religious heresy—not political incendiarism. They were not placed in the fire for compassing the king's death, or seeking the destruction of the civil institutions of the kingdom; but for affirming that there *was* material bread remaining in the Eucharist after certain syllables had been pronounced over it by the priest, the contrary to which they were called upon to believe. Had any one of them been duly convicted of treasonable practices, then their persecutors might have had a plea for their cruelties; but as their crimes consisted only of questioning the metaphysics of the Church of Rome, posterity can have no other feelings toward their adversaries than those of disgust and horror.

That the Church of Rome might have been in

danger from the teachings of the Lollards there can be no question. It was rotten to the core. About the same time that the above-named vindictive statute was passed, by a singular coincidence a catalogue of abuses that had crept into it was drawn up at the command of the king by the University of Oxford, in order that they might be laid before the council of Constance. That catalogue consisted of forty-six articles, and a more hideous picture of the manners of the clergy which these articles unfold could not well be imagined—avarice and debauchery standing prominently in its foreground, and all other sins to which human infirmity is prone forming its background. It is in the universal corruption of the Church at this period that the true cause for the bitter persecution which raged against the Lollards is to be found, for it bred that most bloated of all vices, bigotry, in the train of which, malice, and envy, and hatred, and cruelty, and destruction followed.

After the passing of the vindictive statute at Leicester great numbers of Lollards were apprehended. The prisons of the Church became crowded. There was not room enough to hold them all, for we find Chicheley built an addition to Lambeth palace for their reception. That addition, which still exists, is known as the Lollards' Tower, and it would appear that those who were confined in its upper apartment on a charge of heresy, were tied to iron rings, which are still remaining in its walls; and over which, on the wainscot, the names of some of the sufferers are rudely scratched. In August, 1415, John Claydon, a



LOLLARDS' PRISON.

furrier in London, was brought before the primate as a relapsed heretic. Claydon had been imprisoned for Lollardie two years in Conway castle, and three years in the Fleet; but he had abjured it before Arundel, and obtained his release. But he was still suspected of adhering to its doctrines, and on his house being searched by the mayor, a book called 'The Lantern of Light' was found. It was proved by his servants that their master had been in the habit of hearing this book read to him, not being able to read it himself, and they asserted that he seemed to approve what he had heard. Other books of a similar character were found, but 'The Lantern of Light' was the one which ensured his destruction. Examined by doctors, it was declared to be full of heresies, and the book and its possessor were consigned by Chicheley to the flames; and in the same year that John Claydon, the furrier, was burnt at Smithfield, Richard Turmin, a baker of London, underwent the same fate.

To relate all the trials of the Lollards during the primacy of Chicheley would be tedious. At every death his desire for more victims seemed to grow stronger and stronger. The measure of his iniquities was filled up by a constitution made in the year 1416, by this model of a primate. That constitution enjoined all suffragans and archdeacons, with their officials and commissaries, to make inquisition twice every year, after persons suspected of heresy. Wherever reputed heretics were reported to dwell, three or more inhabitants of the parish were compelled to take an oath that they would certify to the suffragans, or their officers, what persons were heretics, who kept private conventicles, who differed in life and manners from the common conversation of the faithful, who had suspected books in the vulgar tongue, or were conversant with persons suspected of error. On such information, process was to issue against the accused, who were to be delivered over to the secular court, or imprisoned till the next convocation. If this could not extirpate heresy what could? By it the horrors of the writ for burning heretics were completed. It set up an inquisition in every parish, sent terror and distrust into every family, and filled every dwelling with discord and suspicion. It is on record that multitudes, by this most hellish system, were consigned to the dungeon or the stake through the medium of their nearest kindred or their dearest connections, so that a man's foes were truly those of his own household.

The last years of the reign of Henry V., as regards the ecclesiastical annals, consist chiefly of the trials of heretics. And these trials continued unabated in the early part of the reign of Henry VI. It was found, however, impossible to put all those whom the spiritual courts found guilty of heresy to death; and Chicheley had recourse to prolonged imprisonment, whipping, and other punishments, to stem the tide of Lollardie. Those of the clergy, however, who bred and taught the new opinions, on conviction, had no mercy shown to them. In the year 1423, four ecclesiastics were burnt at Smithfield for the crime of promulgating them from their pulpits. But after all, Chicheley, who died in the year 1443, left his bloody work unfinished. As of old, although many had been cut off, and others had fainted in the fiery trial, choosing rather to be hypocrites than martyrs, persecution only tended to increase the numbers of those whose faith differed from that of their persecutors.

But during Chicheley's primacy it was not only in England that persecution raged against those who had imbibed the doctrines of the great reformer, Wycliffe. Those doctrines had spread far and wide throughout Europe. Chiefly by the instrumentality of Anne of Bohemia, the first queen of Richard II., they had especially been introduced into her native country, where they had taken deep root, and had

brought forth rich fruits. And there, unlike England, there was no one to carry on the work of persecution. No Arundel had commenced the work of persecution, and no Chicheley, therefore, was required to carry it on. But at Rome there was a Pope who was more powerful than the primates of England. The schism in the papacy had passed away, and Martin V. held full possession of the papal chair. While the schism lasted, the papal power and pride had greatly diminished. When three Popes were contending against each other they were humble before kings whose aid each sought to support their pretensions. But when Martin V. sat in St. Peter's chair, with no one trying to jostle him out of it, he became as extravagant in his claims as the haughtiest of his most potent predecessors. Archbishop Chicheley, that haughty and bloodthirsty primate, trembled before him; for when, in his bulls, Martin rebuked him, A.D. 1426-7, for suffering the law, called *premunire*, which prevented the Popes from disposing of all the benefices, to exist as long as it had done, and in order to regain his favour, he entreated the commons with prayers and even tears, but in vain, to repeal the obnoxious act. It was this Pope Martin that took up the cause of the Church in Bohemia. Alarmed at the growth of "heresy," which had sprung up there through the writings of Wycliffe, in the year 1428 he published a bull which he sent into England and other countries, commanding solemn processions to be made on the first Sunday of every month in all churches and churchyards, in order to draw down the vengeance of heaven on the heretical Bohemians! Every one who attended these processions, or who said twenty-five paternosters with the same pious intention, was promised sixty days' indulgence in whatever sin they chose to commit! But Pope Martin did not trust wholly to supernatural interposition. It is clear, indeed, that he had more faith in the sword than processions and paternosters. He proclaimed a crusade against the Bohemians, holding out the comfortable assurance that all who died in the expedition should enjoy an eternity of bliss, and all who survived the war, indulgences according to the value of their services. With such rewards before them, many English engaged in that crusade—led thither by the cardinal of Winchester. At the head of these crusaders of various nations was the emperor Sigismund; but the brave Bohemians triumphed over them, and the council of Basil then sitting was fain to enter into negotiations with them in order to bring them back to the communion of the Church. But the Bohemians demanded certain points of reformation which the council would not grant, and they were left to enjoy their own opinions. Supernatural interposition, and the sword, and negotiation, all failed to induce them to renounce the doctrines of the English Reformer, Wycliffe. Bohemia, indeed, became a great bulwark of Christianity.

Archbishop Chicheley was succeeded in the primacy by John Stafford, bishop of Bath, a son of the earl of Stafford. At this time a violent contest had arisen between the clergy and the common lawyers about the meaning of a single word in the statute of premunire. The statute enacted that "if any purchase or pursue, or cause to be purchased or pursued in the court of Rome or *elsewhere*, any such transactions, processes, and sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments, or any other things which touch the king, against him, his regality, or realm, they shall incur the penalties of the statute." The clergy understood that the court of Rome or elsewhere meant Rome or any other place; but the lawyers argued that it signified the court of Rome or any other court. The courts at Westminster had acted upon this latter view, for when any spiritual court in England had presumed to judge any cause not strictly belonging to them, those courts had not only granted prohibitions, but punished the spiritual judges as in a premunire. The clergy looked upon this as a grievance. They conceived that the spiritual courts had as good a right and were better qualified to act as the interpreters of acts of parliament than the courts at Westminster; and hence, in the year 1447, the two archbishops, with their suffragans and clergy, presented a petition to parliament in which they loudly complained of the presumption of those courts in overruling the spiritual courts, and entreated an explanation of the word "elsewhere," in the statute of Richard II., agreeable to their views. But this petition was disregarded. There was a general feeling that the clergy had already too much power, and the parliament, indisposed to increase it, turned a deaf ear to their prayer: and thus ended the famous dispute about the word "elsewhere."

While the clergy were seeking to increase their power in England they were not disposed at this period to submit to a power which the Church had for ages deemed that to which even kings should bow. By the Popes, all the clergy in the Christian world were considered to be their immediate subjects, on whom they might impose what taxes they pleased. But the ecclesiastics loved their money better than the Pope. They might exalt him in the eyes of the people, but when he came to touch their money, who so mean as he? His call for taxes was often made in vain. There was a large amount of arrears outstanding, and there was no means of enforcing payment by legal process. In this extremity Pope Eugenius sought the aid of kings and princes. Having imposed a tax of one-tenth of their benefices on all the clergy of the Church of England, he paid court to Henry VI., to induce him to compel the refractory ecclesiastics to pay on demand. He sent him a consecrated rose. It was a beautiful rose, and according to the bull which he sent with it, it was of priceless value. And the value of the present was greatly heightened by the pontiff's explanation of the mysterious meanings which lay hidden in that rose. He held that he had done Henry the highest honour by sending him so precious a present, and therefore he was not backward in asking him to exert his authority over the clergy to make them pay the tax pleasantly. But while the rose was received with great ceremony, and the primate Stafford, who was also chancellor, descanted eloquently on its beauties and its virtues, it had no effect in filling the pontiff's coffers. Stafford informed the collector who brought it, that the king would send some persons to speak to him on the subject of the tax, but, in the meantime, he forbade him to collect any money in England.

Stafford was succeeded in the primacy by John Kemp, archbishop of York, in 1452. Kemp lived only two years, and at his death, Thomas Bourchier, bishop of Ely, and brother to the earl of Essex, became primate. All these bishops were likewise cardinals, and each of them for a time held the office of lord high chancellor.

The work of persecution still continued. Stafford and Kemp were zealous in rooting out "heresy," and Bourchier followed the example of all the primates of the period. That the Church was, during his primacy, possessed by the fiercest spirit of intolerance is manifest from the fact that its fury was not satisfied with the victims in honour of her sacramental mystery. She seized upon one of the most illustrious of her own champions, whose principal error was, that he was too enlightened and candid for the age, and condescended to address the reason of the people, instead of contenting himself with an appeal to their credulity or their fears. This was Dr. Reginald Pecock or Pocock, bishop of Chichester.

Pecock was one of the most learned men of the age. He began his career as orthodox as the Church could well desire, for he powerfully vindicated, both in the pulpit and by his writings, those abuses which had been loudly arraigned by the reformer Wycliffe. Thus he affirmed that bishops were by the very nature of their office exempt from the duty of preaching; that they were under no obligation to strict residence on their sees; and that they might receive their bishoprics by papal provision, and pay first-fruits or *annates* to the Pope without justly incurring the charge of simony. But it does not appear that Pecock's apology for his brethren was dictated by a defective sense of the sacred importance of their duties. As regards their non-obligation to preach, his idea was, that if they were exempt from that duty they would be better able to exercise superintendence over those who were ordained to preach, and would have more leisure for enforcing religious truth by evidence and argument. Then as regards the absence of bishops from their sees, he maintained that there were many reasonable causes which might justify it, and might render it more beneficial to the Church and the realm than a constant confinement to the seat of their episcopal office, especially as their services were often required in his majesty's council. With respect to papal provision, and payment of *annates* or first-fruits, his defence was grounded on the absurdity that the Pope as universal pastor was lord of all the benefices in Christendom, and that therefore it would not be simoniacal to render him a part of that which belonged to him as a whole. But while Pecock ably defended the abuses and delinquencies of the Church, he was not a persecutor of the Lollards. His object was to give such an exposition of the doctrines and practices of the Church as might win them back to her communion. But his moderation laid him open to suspicion, and he was the more suspected because he had been one of the eminent scholars patronised by "the good Duke Humphrey." Still, down to the year 1450 the Church did not display any open hostility towards him. On the contrary, in that year he was translated from the see of St. Asaph to that of Chichester. But after his translation he composed a treatise on Faith, which finally brought about his ruin. In that treatise his moderation and candour were so distinctly manifested, that the suspicions of the churchmen were confirmed, and they became alarmed at his plain speaking. Wycliffe himself might have written that treatise, so bold was its denunciations against some of the errors and practices of the Church, and so scriptural in its views. In the first place, he assailed the contemptible style of preaching introduced by the mendicants; preachers who substituted fable and romance for gospel truths, and "split the ears" of their congregations with vociferous encomiums of their saints. Pecock was too learned and enlightened to tolerate such pernicious extravagances. He boldly charged these preaching friars with heresy and superstition, and in order to show his contempt of them, denounced them as "pulpit brawlers." But this might have been passed over, as the arrogance of these mendicant friars had long made them obnoxious, both to the secular and monastic clergy. Pecock, however, did not stop here. Like another Samson, he placed himself between the main pillars that supported the fabric of the papacy, and if he did not pull them down, he shook them to their foundations. The Holy Scriptures, he declared, were the substantial foundation of our faith, and the only rule or standard of revealed or supernatural truth; and again, he affirmed that to attempt the reduction of the Lollards by means of a principle so questionable as the infallibility of the priesthood, was a vain and hopeless task. Now it was that the tide of persecution set in against this bold teacher. And it was not only by the Church that he was persecuted: several of his doctrines which upheld the Church, such as that the Pope was master of all the benefices in Christendom, were unpopular among the laity; and *they* joined in the hue and cry against him. On the one hand, therefore, he was persecuted for upholding the Church, and on the other for endeavouring to purify its doctrines and practices. The very peers stood aloof from him. In the year 1457 he was expelled the house of lords, and forbidden to enter into the king's presence. So bitter was the exasperation against him that the peers refused to proceed to business so long as Pecock continued in the house. At length he was brought before the primate, charged with heresy and other offences, so framed as to deprive him of the sympathy of the people. But it was on the charge of heresy that he was convicted: his denial of the infallibility of the Church being the chief accusation laid against him. The only choice left him was abjuration or the stake. It was a tremendous alternative, and Pecock, learned as he was, had not sufficient fortitude to abide the fiery trial. He replied "that it would be better for him to become the gazing stock of the people than to desert the law of faith, and to be sent after his death into hell fire. He, therefore, made it his desire to abjure, and so to frame his life in future as to give no cause for suspicion or reproach." It is evident by this that Pecock, although enlightened above his age, still had a lingering faith in the power of the Church of which he was so distinguished a member, otherwise he would not have stood in dread of that Church sending him to perdition through the flames of mar-

tyrdom. But though he escaped death, he did not escape punishment. The tender mercies of the Church were like those of the wicked spoken of by the Psalmist—cruel. His abjuration was performed under circumstances of humiliation, to which even the bitterness of death by fire might have been preferred. He was conveyed to St. Paul's Cross in his stole, or episcopal habit, and placed at the primate's feet. His books were delivered by his own hand to an officer who cast them into the flames before his face. Then, in the presence of twenty thousand people, he read his abjuration; in which he confessed himself a miserable sinner, who had walked in darkness, but who was now, by God's mercy, brought back to the right way; and exhorted all men, in the name and virtue of Almighty God, to give no faith or credence to his pernicious doctrines. Surely the Church might have been satisfied with this abject renunciation of his doctrines, and have set Pecock at liberty. He had done what he could to restore its pillars which he had so fearfully shaken by his treatise of Faith, and the book itself had been consigned to the flames. But his cup of affliction was not yet drained. He had yet to taste the tender mercies of that Church he had defended. Perhaps he was still an object of suspicion, for his recantation might not prove sincere. All his books had been burnt: he might, if set at liberty, write more. The fear of death having passed away, he might repent of what he had done, and, as others had done before him, still die at the stake in the cause of Faith. It is evident, indeed, that his enemies were not disposed to trust him, for if they did not burn him, it may almost be said that they buried him alive. He was sent to Thorney Abbey, in Cambridgeshire, where, in a single chamber, which he was never suffered to leave, debarred from the use of pen, ink, or paper, and of every book except a mass-book, a Psalter, a legend, and a Bible, he dragged out the remainder of his life. How long he lived in this utter seclusion from the world is not known; but it is probable, though various accounts are given of his death, that his miseries were shortly terminated.

"Such," remarks Le Bas, "was the end of this eminent churchman, undoubtedly among the most learned of his age and country. His spirit was far too equitable and moderate for the period in which he lived. As an instance of this, like the heresiarch, whose doctrines he combated, he ventured to address his countrymen in their own language on questions involving the salvation of their souls, a practice which was thought to draw aside the curtains of mystery, and to invite the vulgar gaze to the secrets of the chamber within. He fell into another egregious controversial solecism. Instead of assailing the Lollards with asperity and menace, he treated the accursed Separatists with gentleness and patience. He heard their scruples and objections with mildness; nay, he even thought that heretics might be argued with, before they were finally delivered over to the secular arm as incorrigibly obstinate. This of itself was a practical heresy, of the darkest complexion in the eyes of a priesthood who would hear of nothing but implicit faith. In short, he inadvertently dashed his head against that bulwark of advancement which had been raised to make the papal fortress impregnable—the infallibility of the Church: a doctrine of which in that age it might be truly said, that he who fell upon it should be shattered, and he on whom it fell should be crushed to death. His fate was a warning to the inquisitive world. If Bishop Pecock, the illustrious defender of the Church, was to be entombed in a dungeon, what was to be expected of those who assailed her doctrines and execrated her tyranny and corruption?"

During the distracting wars of the roses there are, as Fuller remarks, but scanty materials for "Church story." Some writers have conceived that because we hear of only one person being burnt for heresy in the reign of Edward IV., the long and cruel persecution which the Lollards had endured, either had diminished their number or shaken their constancy, so that the Church had no need to continue its rigour. There appears to be no foundation for such a supposition. On the contrary, there is full proof that their numbers increased during that period, for when Henry VII. wrested the sceptre from the House of Lancaster, the flames of persecution burst forth with redoubled fury, and there was no lack of victims. Fuller is more correct in his notion of the lull which occurred in the storm of persecution during the long period of intestine commotion. He quaintly remarks:—"The sound of bells in the steeple was drowned with the noise of drums and trumpets. And yet this good was done by the civil wars, that they diverted the prelates from troubling the Lollards: so that this very storm was a shelter to those poor souls, and the heat of these intestine enmities cooled the persecution against them."

Like all the other monarchs of this period, Edward IV., on ascending the throne, courted the support of the clergy. At his accession, in order to obtain it, he granted them a charter which rendered them almost independent of the civil government, and left them to act as they pleased. By that charter he dispensed with the statute of premunire, the repeal of which the Church had so long sought in vain, and discharged all magistrates and judges from the duty of taking any cognizance of crimes committed by the clergy, from the primate to the deacon. Henceforth they might commit treason, murder, rape, theft, or whatever crime they chose to indulge in with impunity. Nay, a man might shelter himself from punishment under this charter although only a simple layman; for if he asserted that he was in orders when apprehended for any crime, the civil court was deprived of all jurisdiction over him. He was to be delivered to the bishop or his official to determine whether he was in orders or not. As might have been expected, the effects of this charter were of the most fearful character. Licentious and wicked as the clergy were before, their licentiousness and wickedness increased ten fold. So flagrant was their conduct that the primate Bourchier granted a commission to his commissary-general to attempt some reformation: from which commission we learn that, taking advantage of their exemption from civil authority, many of the clergy, both secular and regular, strolled about the country with wantons, spending their revenues in feasting, drunkenness,

and adultery. But the primate's commission does not appear to have affected any reformation in the manners of the clergy. How could it, when he himself was persecuting those, who by their blameless lives and conduct, as well as by their writings, proved themselves to be at this corrupt period "the salt of the earth?" That the clergy became intolerable pests to society towards the close of the rule of the House of Lancaster there is the clearest evidence. By their own showing such was the case; for the clergy of the provinces of Canterbury and York presented a supplication to Richard III., in which they complained of being cruelly, grievously, and daily troubled, vexed, indicted, and arrested; and prayed that by letters patent he would see that such remedies were applied to their wrongs, that the liberties of Christ's Church might be confirmed! And Richard graciously listened to this curious supplication, and gave them, like Edward IV., license to sin with impunity; for he issued the prayed-for letters patent which confirmed those of King Edward, and granted them complete emancipation from the jurisdiction of the civil courts.

During the whole of this period the Romish Church set its face against all reform or concession to the spirit of the age. The more its errors and superstitions were exposed, the more tenaciously did it cling to them. There might be some few amendments attempted on points of mere order and discipline, but on the doctrinal questions at issue between those who adhered to the papal system and their opponents, there was not the slightest approach made towards the new opinions. Like the law of the Medes and Persians, the old doctrines remained unaltered; or, if there was any deviation, they were made more corrupt and infallible than ever. The two most noted reforms attempted in this period were, the prohibition, by Arundel, of holding fairs and markets in churchyards on Sundays, except in harvest, and the forbidding, by Chicheley, of barber-surgeons keeping their shops open on the Lord's day, which, by a singular mistake, he described thus:— "The Lord's day, namely, the *seventh* day of the week, which the Lord made blessed and holy, and on which, after his six days' works, he rested from his labour." As regards ritual observances, they were made more burdensome than they had been in any preceding period. Cruelty and superstition went hand in hand like twin demons. Arundel took the lead in both. He was particularly zealous for the adoration of the Virgin Mary. It was to her patronage that he ascribed all the prosperity of the English nation, and particularly the revolution which restored him to his see. Hence out of gratitude he amplified the ceremonial of her worship. The churches were crowded with her images and other saints, to which greater homage was paid than to the Supreme Being. The saints became multiplied. The two virgins, St. Fridiswida, and St. Ethelrida, and St. Osmund the bishop were canonized in this period, and festivals instituted to their honour. The festivals of other saints, as of St. George, St. Edward the Confessor, and the visitation of the Virgin Mary, were made double festivals, and many additional ceremonies were appointed to be observed. To every new saint a festival day was set apart, and the number of holidays was therefore considerably increased. The saints days and holidays were numerous even to the hindrance of gathering in the harvest, and to the certain and perpetual encouragement of riot and revelry throughout the country. The people were wholly, through the teaching of the clergy, both secular and regular, given to superstition. They ran to the churches for holy water, of which the devil was said to be afraid, before a thunder-storm; and fled to St. Rooke in time of pestilence. The grossest pretensions which indulgence could advance were swallowed with the greatest eagerness. Relics carrying the impress of imposture on their very face were kissed with the most pious credulity. As for pilgrimages, they were still undertaken in the spirit of the company in the Canterbury Tales; and the veneration for holy wells was still a favourite species of devotion. The shrines of saints were made rich with the offerings of pious devotees. Whilst no man brought his gift to the altar of the Saviour, there was not a saint, however humble, canonized by the Church, to whom the people did not make their offerings. Great stress was also laid on confessions to priests and their pardons, and the people appear to have had much to confess, and to have stood much in need of pardon. There were thirty-seven kinds of sin which none but the Pope or a bishop could forgive, at the head of which stands heresy, which no pope or bishop forgave. They held that they had the power to forgive the heretic; but if he retained his heresies, there was no mercy for him. If he even fled to the horns of the altar, where felons of all kinds might obtain sanctuary, he might be legally pursued and captured; for to the Lollard and the Lollard only, the gate of mercy was closed. There was nothing which the clergy could do in this period to bind the people in the iron chains of superstition that was not done. It was now that the cup in the Sacrament in the Eucharist was taken from the laity as too mystical and sacred for their profane lips. The people were taught that the body and blood of Christ were given at once in the bread. To reconcile them to this change they were told that the wine was mere wine; that it was not the Sacrament, but had only been given to make them swallow the bread more easily. There appears to have been some fears that the laity would not comply with this departure from the ancient practice, for the cup was at first only withheld in obscure churches; but the clergy had such power over the minds of the ignorant multitude, that they learned to adopt the new usage of taking the Sacrament to which they were earnestly exhorted, namely, to swallow the bread, which was at once "bread and wine" without chewing, that none of it might stick in their teeth.

It was out of this chaos of darkness that Wycliffe sought to bring light. With what result previous pages show. His efforts brought on a great struggle between light and darkness, and at the close of this period the darkness still prevailed. But in his translation of the Scriptures into plain English existed the dawn of the reformation. His great glory was this, that he gave to the people the pure word of God. It was a light that could never be quenched by the fiercest persecution; it might be obscured by

it, but never put out. When once the people had tasted of that word of life, an eager appetite for Scriptural knowledge was excited among them, which induced them to render any sacrifice, any risk, any danger to gratify. At the commencement of this period, when entire copies of the Bible could only be multiplied by means of amanuenses, the precious book was too costly to be within the reach of many readers; but those who could not procure it as a whole would give even a load of hay for a few favourite chapters. Many such scraps were consumed upon the persons of the martyrs at the stake. But towards the close of this period the Scriptures became more widely diffused through the noble art of printing; and then was more clearly seen the effects of Wycliffe's "Labour of Love." By the wider diffusion of the Scriptures in the mother-tongue, the minds of men were becoming generally alienated from the Church of Rome, by reason of its more clearly discerned corruptions; and a sect, neither few in numbers nor wanting in courage and activity, existed in the heart of the kingdom ready to profit by any occasion which might offer of opening the eyes of their countrymen. The angel had "come down to trouble the water, and there was only wanted some providential crisis to put the nation into it, that it might be made whole."

During this period the mendicant friars who had lived on the fat of the land, fell into considerable disrepute. A blow was struck at their power as early as A.D. 1402, when a statute was passed, which ordained that no friar of any of the four orders—the Minorites, Augustines, Preachers, and Carmelites—should take into their order any infant under the age of fourteen, without the consent of his nearest relations and guardians, nor should remove such infant during the first year after his reception, away from the place where he had been received. That this statute might be duly observed, the principals of the four orders were required to make oath before the king, lords, and commons in parliament, with their right hands laying on their breasts, that they would hold, keep, observe, and perform its ordinances for themselves and successors for ever. The evil which it was the object of this law to put down, had become so prevalent, that it had created a stern opposition to the mendicant orders. It was alleged against them, that they haunted the universities for the purpose of seducing into their ranks the more promising of the students — a circumstance which deterred many parents from sending their sons to these national establishments; thereby causing them to fall into a state of semi-decay. Nor was it the universities only that were jealous of the mendicant friars: they had successfully competed with the secular clergy for the popular reverence and favour, and there was a grand quarrel between them, in which each party maintained its cause by the most violent abuse of its opponents. Their quarrel reached its height in the reign of Edward IV. The mendicants maintained that Christ himself while on earth had been a beggar, and that, therefore, he had belonged to their class, and they were his special favourites. This assertion was denounced by the secular clergy as both false and impious. They wrote against it with the greatest bitterness; and at length Pope Calixtus II. stepped in and settled the controversy; for in the year 1475 he published a bull in which he declared the doctrine to be heretical.

Some notion of the mode of preaching at this period may be formed from some remarkable canons, published by Nevile, archbishop of York, A.D. 1466. In the first place, every parish priest was commanded to preach four times in the year to his people, either in person or by another, and explain to them in English the fourteen articles of faith, the ten precepts of the decalogue, the two precepts of the gospel, the seven works of mercy, the seven principal virtues, and the seven sacraments of grace. To enable them to perform this onerous task an explanation of each of these particulars was subjoined, which may be said to comprehend the whole body of the Catholic theology of the fifteenth century. An idea of this theology may be seen by a reference to the explanation of the ten precepts of the decalogue. Thus, the first command ment was said to be a prohibition of all enchantments, superstitious characters, and such figments. The second commandment was altogether omitted, and to keep up the number the tenth was divided into two. It would not have done for the clergy to have offered any explanation of the omitted commandment, as it struck at the very root of an integral part of their ritual services; that of filling their churches with graven images, and substituting the worship of saints for that of the Almighty. Omissions were also made in the explanation of other subjects on which the clergy were commanded to preach. Luxury, for instance, in which the hierarchy were prone to indulge, was one of the seven mortal sins; but the convocation by which the canons were framed, would not touch upon that "for fear of corrupting the air." But although quarterly sermons were prescribed to the clergy, they do not appear to have been insisted upon. Mass was on no account to be left unsaid for a single Sunday, but sermons might be omitted for twenty Sundays together and no notice taken of the omission. The mendicant friars, however, were more diligent in preaching. They were by no means dumb dogs; but they barked to little purpose. Their barking tended rather to prove "that they were more hungry than watchful." Their discourses had, for their main object, the filling of their own wallets, not the satisfying their hearers' wants; and if not occupied with invectives against the regular and secular clergy, they were a mere tissue of fables and old wives' tales. The extent of scriptural knowledge imparted to the people was that which was conveyed to them in miracle plays; not in sermons from the pulpit. The sabbath, indeed, was rather a day of sports and pastimes than of devotion and instruction. In a word, the Church of England during the whole of this period presents a melancholy picture of utter corruption. To adopt the prophet's complaint of Judah, "From the sole of the foot even unto the head there was no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises, and putrefying sores:" the "whole head was sick and the whole heart faint."

The ecclesiastical history of Scotland is as imperfectly preserved in this as in the previous period. So far as can be ascertained, it consists principally of

the enumeration of a series of provincial councils, the records of which were destroyed at the reformation, with the libraries in which they had been deposited, or carried into foreign countries. These councils appear to have been generally held at Perth. It is supposed, from the circumstance that one of them is called "the annual council of the clergy," that they were annually celebrated; but the list of councils extant is far from showing one a year. As regards the loss of the records there is not much cause for regret, as the canons of all the national churches at this period were counterparts of each other. In its character, indeed, the Church of Scotland was the same as that of England, and of all the other countries of christendom. Its general condition has thus been described by Pinkerton:—"The privileges of the Church seem to have been an exemption from tribute and war, and from the sentence of a temporal judge; a judicial authority of the spiritual causes of tithes, testaments, matrimonial, and heretical affairs; freedom to let lands and tithes; submission to no foreign Church, but to the Pope alone; a power of holding provincial councils for the regulation of the national Church. In benefices, the Pope had only the right of confirmation and deprivation, and the purchase of any benefice at Rome was strictly prohibited. The bishops were elected by the chapter, and the royal recommendation seems seldom to have intervened. Abbots were chosen by the monks alone: the secular clergy were named by the proprietors of the lands. These clergy were either rectors or vicars. Many were in the appointment of the bishops, and of collegiate bodies, whose chapters they formed. Hence the lay patronage was much confined. Many sees and abbeys were opulent; but James III. seems to have been the first monarch who seized and made a traffic of the nomination." If a see was vacant, James II. claimed a right to present to all the livings while the temporalities were in his hands; and the clergy, in convocation at Perth, A.D. 1459, confirmed that right, which appears to have been the ancient custom, although it had been set aside during the long period of the regency, when the rights of the crown were almost annihilated.

Down to the year 1472 there had been no primate in Scotland. The bishop of St. Andrew's had probably the precedence of all other prelates, but they were not his suffragans. Patrick Graham, nephew of James I., had, A.D. 1466, succeeded the best of all the prelates of the fifteenth century—Kennedy—in that see, but as he was obnoxious to the Boyds, then the favourites of James III., he had many difficulties to encounter. To avoid their displeasure, and to obtain the confirmation of his election, he went to Rome, where he spent several years in a species of exile. While the Boyds were supreme he dared not return to Scotland; but on their downfal he came back to his native country. And he returned, not as a simple bishop, but as a primate; for while at Rome Pope Sixtus IV. had erected the see of St. Andrew's into an archbishopric, and had constituted Graham and his successors primate of all Scotland: thus sweeping away the claim of the archbishops of York now renewed to that high dignity. The new primate was also appointed the Pope's legate, and with such dignities, and enjoying the favour of the sovereign pontiff, he naturally expected that he would be received with favour, both by the king and the prelates of Scotland. But his new honours proved his ruin. The Scottish prelates were envious of his dignities, and his powers as legate were dreaded by both them and the nobles. His most inveterate enemy was William Shevez, who stood high in the favour of the king, chiefly, it would appear, from his skill in the doubtful science of astrology, in which James III. was a devout believer. Shevez had studied astrology in the university of Louvain under the famous Spiricus, and James presented him with the archdeaconry of St. Andrew's. Graham, however, who had a sovereign contempt for the science and its professors, refused to admit him to that office, and enraged at his refusal, Shevez banded with others to effect his ruin. He was committed to prison, where he died, A.D. 1478. Shevez succeeded him in his primacy; which dignity he enjoyed till his death, A.D. 1496.

In all countries during this dark era the spirit of popery was the same. Soon after the new doctrines made their appearance in the south, they were promulgated in the northern part of the island. They appear to have been first made known by some of those who fled from the persecution promoted by the primate Arundel. But the Lollards found no sure refuge in Scotland. There was the same spirit of persecution abroad there as in England. Thus, in the year 1407, John Risby, an English priest, was apprehended as a Wycliffite, and was burnt at the stake at Perth. He was charged with maintaining forty erroneous opinions, the most offensive of which appears to have been, that he held the Pope was not Christ's vicar, and that if he was a man of wicked life he was not a Pope at all. The fate of Risby, like that of Sautree in England, appears to have struck terror into the minds of the Lollards in Scotland, for a second martyrdom did not take place till A.D. 1433, when a Bohemian physician, named Crawar, perished at the stake at St. Andrew's. That Lollardism early obtained an extensive diffusion in Scotland is clear, from the accounts of the trial of Crawar, who is spoken of as an emissary from Bohemia to a numerous body who maintained the same doctrines as himself. It is also evidenced by a statute passed for its suppression by parliament immediately after James I. returned from England, A.D. 1421, in which every bishop was enjoined to search out all Lollards in their respective dioceses, that they might be punished according to the laws of the Church. But, notwithstanding the efforts made to suppress the new opinions, they still spread, and there was at the close of this period in Scotland, as there were in England, many who secretly cherished them in their hearts, if they dared not openly avow their faith. It was in vain that the civil power aided the ecclesiastical in rooting out the doctrines of these early reformers: the good seed they sowed had therein a vital power, which no persecution, however bitter and deadly in its operations, could destroy. Watered, indeed, by the blood of the martyrs, it only flourished the more abundantly, until it grew into a wide-spreading tree of Christian liberty.

thirty-one shillings and fourpence. Books, therefore, of any size were costly articles. They were given with all the formality of deeds or bequests, by will, and the right of perusal was often reserved to the donors or their nominees. Even after the art of printing came into use, the price of books was for a considerable time as excessive as ever; especially of those which still continued in manuscript. Every considerable library, indeed, chiefly consisted of manuscripts, for it was only a few most in request that were first issued from Caxton's press: religious books

CAXTON'S PRINTING-OFFICE.

and romances forming the two largest divisions in his list. Concerning the libraries of the fifteenth century, reference to that which Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, gave to the university of Oxford, about the year 1440, will afford an illustration. That library contained six hundred volumes, one hundred and twenty of which alone were valued at one thousand pounds. Warton says, "They were the most splendid and costly copies that could be procured, finely written on vellum, and elegantly embellished with miniatures and illuminations. Among the rest was a translation into French of Ovid's Metamorphoses. Only a single specimen of these valuable volumes was suffered to remain; it is a beautiful manuscript, in folio, of Valerius Maximus, enriched with the most elegant decorations, and written in Duke Humphrey's age, evidently with a design of being placed in this sumptuous collection. All the rest of the books which, like this, being highly ornamented, looked like missals, and conveyed ideas of popish superstition, were destroyed or removed by the pious visitors of the university, in the reign of Edward VI., whose zeal was only equalled by their ignorance, or perhaps by their avarice." According to Warton, the duke of Gloucester was one of the most distinguished patrons of learning in this century, for he says that his patronage was not confined to English scholars; and that the most celebrated writers of France and Italy solicited his favour, and shared his bounty. Duke Humphrey also employed several learned foreigners in transcribing, and in making translations of Greek works into Latin; and if he did not write a small tract on astronomy, which has been ascribed to him, it was compiled at his instance, after tables which he had constructed.

From the scarcity and high price of books, libraries were chiefly confined to palaces, universities, and monasteries; and many even of those most noted were not distinguished for any great number of volumes, or as regards literary merit, for the value of their contents. Thus, the royal library of France, which had been collected by Charles V., VI., and VII., and which was purchased by the duke of Bedford in 1425, for twelve hundred livres, contained only about nine hundred volumes; and from a catalogue of that library, still extant, it appears to have been chiefly composed of legends, histories, romances, and books on astrology, geomancy, and chiromancy. Kings, it would appear, were often borrowers of books, which sometimes they forgot to return. Henry V., for instance, borrowed several which were claimed by their owners after his death, and which they had some trouble in getting back again. Thus, in the year 1424, the countess of Westmoreland presented a petition to the privy council, representing that the king had borrowed from her the 'Chronicles of Jerusalem, and the Expedition of Godfrey of Boulogne,' and praying that an order might be given under the privy seal for the restoration of the said book, which was granted with great formality. Henry had also borrowed the works of St. Gregory of John, the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, who presented a similar petition to the privy council; and when the prior of Shene, to whom the king appears to have sub-lent it, refused to give it up, he was required by a precept under the privy seal forthwith to restore it, or to appear before the council to give the reason of his refusal. The faculty of medicine at Paris were wiser than the countess and prior, for when Louis XI. wished to borrow a copy of the works of the Arabian physician, Rhasis, for the purpose of transcription, the loan was sternly refused until he had deposited in pledge for it a considerable quantity of valuable plate, and had procured a nobleman to join with him as surety in a deed by which he bound himself to return it uninjured, under a considerable forfeiture. Pledges were, indeed, frequently required as securities for books lent to be restored to their owners; thus at once proving their scarcity, and the great value set upon them. So scarce were they, that in some establishments it was a rule that no scholar should occupy a book more than one or two hours, that others might not be hindered from consulting its pages.

During the fifteenth century, the Latin language

was still generally used by divines, lawyers, philosophers, historians, physicians, and poets; but the knowledge of that language appears to have greatly declined. With but few exceptions, the Latin style of all writers of this period was barbarous; and even the style of those few who did write so as not to offend good taste, cannot be considered classical. As regards Greek, though it was cultivated with assiduity and success in Italy, it was almost unknown both in England and France. Lectures on rhetoric were read in the universities of England; but as the learned languages were so little understood, and the modern languages were imperfect, the science was in a semi-barbarous condition. As regards scholastic philosophy and theology, few or none made any distinguished figure therein, although it still reigned supreme in all the seats of learning. The schoolmen were still occupied in vain and profitless discussions, spending their time in solemnly arguing such questions as those with which Thomas Aquinas furnished the learned; as, for example, how an angel passed from one place to another; and whether God could annihilate matter? questions which no human intellect, however acute, could solve. Through the enlarged intercourse with the East, the sciences made some progress, which in the end swept away the barbarisms of the Aristotelian philosophy; but, as yet these important results were only "coming events casting their shadows before."

The two leading studies of the period were astrology and alchemy. All who turned their attention either to mathematical or natural philosophy bewildered themselves in these worse than useless sciences. So much was astrology studied by mathematicians, that mathematician and astrologer became synonymous terms. There was, however, now a difference of opinions with regard to the mysterious pursuits of astrology and alchemy, not indeed as regards their marvellous pretensions, for all believed in them; but the great question was, whether they were or were not forbidden by the law of God. It was thought by some that skill in them was an inspiration from the prince of darkness rather than light from heaven. Some have supposed that the first monarch of this period entertained such an opinion, inasmuch as he by an act of parliament made it felony to practise the transmutation of metals; but it is more probable that his prohibition was suggested by an apprehension that the operations of the alchemists would affect the value of the king's coin. But notwithstanding this, the art did not fall into disrepute. On the contrary, Henry VI. encouraged it more than any other art or science. It was held that alchemy could not only change the baser metals into the purest gold, but could also produce a sovereign remedy for all diseases. To preserve so precious an art, therefore, Henry granted protection to different alchemists to secure them from the penalty which his grandfather had awarded them. In one of these protections granted to three "famous men" in the science—John Fauceby, John Kirkeby, and John Rayny—the object of their researches is described to be "a certain most precious medicine which some philosophers have named the mother and queen of medicines, some the inestimable glory, others the quintessence, others the philosopher's stone, and others the elixir of life. The virtue of this medicine," the document goes on to say, "is so admirable and efficacious, that it cures all curable diseases with ease, prolongs human life to its utmost term, and wonderfully preserves man in health and strength of body, and in the full possession of his memory, and of all the powers and faculties of his mind. It heals all curable wounds without difficulty, is a most sovereign antidote against all poisons, and is capable of procuring to us and our kingdom other great advantages, such as the transmutation of other metals into real and fine gold and silver." Henry not only granted these three famous Johns protection in their operations, but he aided them with money that they might "attain to the true method of making this most glorious medicine," which he acknowledges had not yet really been discovered. And that they did not discover it is clear, for in the year 1483, after twenty-seven years' experiments—for the protection was granted and confirmed by parliament in 1456—there was a sweating sickness in London, which carried off two mayors, five aldermen, and a great number of persons of all rank, which no medicine could cure. The royal "liberty-power, warrant, and authority," given to these pretended alchemists to inquire, investigate, begin, prosecute, and perfect the foresaid medicine," and to "transubstantiate other metals into true gold and silver," proved abortive.

Although medicine was now studied in every university, the knowledge of it made but little if any progress during this period. Almost the only work on medicine that appeared in England was written by Dr. Gilbert Kymer, physician to Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, and also to Henry VI., which is simply a dietary for the preservation of health, and not a manual on diseases and their cure. This work, which consists of twenty-six chapters, was dedicated to Duke Humphrey, and is still extant, but for sanitary purposes is valueless. Kymer was a clergyman, holding among other promotions the offices of dean of Salisbury and chancellor of the university of Oxford, from which example it may be concluded that the practice of medicine was still to some extent in the hands of the clergy. Dr. John Fauceby is elsewhere described physician to Henry VI.; but it is probable that he received the appointment simply as an alchemist, who professed to be able to discover the "elixir of life," which would enable the weak-minded monarch to "prolong life, health, and strength of body, and vigour of mind to the greatest possible extent of time." As regards surgery in this period, it was in as rude a state as ever. The warriors of that period were not attended to as they are in modern times. It is recorded that in the army of Henry V., which won the battle of Agincourt, only one surgeon—Thomas Morstede—was present, so that many must have lost their lives for want of surgical assistance. Morstede was to have had fifteen assistants; but they had not landed, and if they had, five of them were to have acted as archers. The surgeon himself was a man-at-arms, so that he can scarcely be supposed to have possessed much skill in the art of surgery. That it was in a rude state, a mere species of mechanical handicraft, there can be no question, for at that period there was very little known of the anatomy of

the human frame. It is recorded, however, that in Paris lithotomy was, for the first time, performed by any modern surgeon in 1474: the experiment being made on a condemned criminal, whose life had been spared by the king, on the petition of the physicians and surgeons of that city, for that purpose. The operation was successful; and from that time lithotomy became a branch of surgery, though it was not yet practised in England.

The literary productions of this period, compared with those of the age in which Chaucer wrote, were of a very humble character. There was neither a divine, philosopher, nor physician, who conferred any honour on his country by his writings. Even the writings of historians, fruitful as the times were in stirring events, do not rise in style above the most unmistakeable mediocrity. Among the best writers was Thomas Walsingham, a monk in the abbey of St. Albans, who, conscious of his literary defects, honestly confesses that his style is rude and unpolished. His narrative, however, though marred with ridiculous stories of visions, miracles, and portents, is more full, circumstantial, and satisfactory than any other chronicler of the times. He compiled two historical works: one entitled, 'A History of England,' which begins in 1273, and concludes with the funeral of Henry V.; and the other, 'A History of Normandy,' from Rollo the Dane, at the beginning of the 10th century, to A.D. 1418. Thomas Otterbourne, a Franciscan friar, compiled a history of England, from the landing of the Trojans to A.D. 1420; and although its early portions are, from the very nature of the materials he derived his information from, worthless, the latter portion, which refers to his own times, is of some, though not of considerable value. The 'Life and Reign of Henry V.,' by Thomas de Elmham, prior of Linton, notwithstanding his barbarous style, contains much valuable information concerning the events of that reign. A free and judicious epitome of that history was subsequently written by an Italian, whose real name is not known, but who assumed the name of Titus Livius, whose style he imitated, but very unsuccessfully, but whose performance, nevertheless, is of great historical value. Livius was one of those learned men who sought the patronage of Duke Humphrey, and who obtained it, for the duke appointed him to be his poet and orator. One of the most valuable chronicles is that of John Whethamstead, abbot of St. Albans, which, although it only extends from the year 1441 to 1461, contains full particulars of that eventful period, and especially of the battle of St. Albans. Whethamstead may be considered a critical historian, for he it was who first disputed the fact that Brutus and his Trojans ever settled in England, as set forth in the popular legend. William Botoner, or William of Worcester, wrote a history of England, from the year 1324 to 1468, which, for the most part, is a mere compilation, and is of very little value, except for fragments which contain matter not found in any other chronicle. The last of the historians who wrote in Latin during this period is John Rouse of Warwick. His work is entitled, 'A History of the Kings of England;' but it commences with the creation of the world, in which portion there is more fiction than fact. Concerning the events of the latter portion of the fifteenth century, it furnishes, however, some interesting and valuable details. In English, Robert Fabyan wrote a chronicle of England and France, called, 'The Concordance of Stories,' which commences with the fabulous age of Brutus and concludes with the year 1504. Fabyan was a merchant and alderman of London, and his work is chiefly valuable for the many particulars it records of that city and its inhabitants. Other chroniclers were John Harding and William Caxton, but their productions are of very little value to the modern historian. The writers and lovers of English history, indeed, are much more indebted to the labours of three French chroniclers—Froissart, Comines, and Monstrelet—for full and circumstantial relations of many events than any of our own contemporary chroniclers.

At this period, the inns of court and chancery were crowded with students of law; but, with the exception of Sir Thomas Littleton and Sir John Fortescue, very few distinguished themselves as authors. Littleton, who was a student of law in the inner temple, finally became one of the judges of the court of common pleas, and he was one of the very few who shared the favours of the rival houses of York and Lancaster. Littleton wrote a work on English tenures of land, which has secured for him a lasting fame as an able author and sound lawyer. Sir John Fortescue, who was the great ornament of his profession, was a student of Lincoln's Inn, and who for his superior knowledge, both of the civil and common law, was, in the year 1442, raised to the dignity of chief-justice of the king's bench. Like Littleton, he enjoyed the favour of the rival houses of York and Lancaster; for although he was a steady adherent of the Lancastrian party, and was taken prisoner after the defeat of Margaret and Prince Edward at the battle of Tewkesbury, his life was spared by Edward IV., and he was restored to liberty and received into favour. Sir John Fortescue's chief literary production is a treatise on the difference between an absolute and limited monarchy, which was designed for the use of Edward IV., whose title he finally acknowledged: and of which it has been justly said that it is "a work which affords full evidence of the learning, wisdom, uprightness, public spirit, and loyal gratitude of its author, as any that is extant in ours or in any modern language."

By this latter clause it will be perceived that this learned writer wrote in the English language, which was now beginning to supersede the Latin. The poets, especially, penned their lucubrations in the mother-tongue. According to Warton and Ritson, there was a crowd of versifiers in this period. Ritson enumerates seventy poets from Chaucer to Lord Surrey: but for the most part they were wretched versifiers. The only names deserving of remembrance, indeed, as poets are those of Thomas Occleve, John Lydgate, and last and greatest of all, King James I. of Scotland—mention of whose works will be found under the head of poetry.

The language of this period is what is called the middle English, which, divested of the obscurity caused by orthographical variation in the old English which it superseded, is in general readily intelligible

to the modern reader. It was in the middle English that Chaucer and Gower wrote their poetry, and that Wycliffe used in his translation of the Scriptures. But it must not be supposed that the transition from old English into middle English was sudden and definite, any more than the semi-Saxon was so changed into old English. The change was effected by a slow process. Nor must it be imagined that this change was simultaneous throughout the kingdom; for ancient forms and idioms were retained in particular districts long after they had in others become obsolete. Caxton, in a preface to one of his imprints, a translation by John de Trevisa, gives a clear idea of the gradual change which was taking place in the English language in these words:—"I, William Caxton, a simple person, have endeavoured me to write over all the said book—have changed the rude and olde English, that is, to wit, certain words which in these days we neither used ne understood—and certainly our language now used varyeth far from that which was spoken when I was born; for we Englishmen ben born under the domination of the moon, which is never stedfast, but ever wavering; and common English that is spoken in one shire varyeth from another."

As a specimen of the state of the language at the close of this period the following extract from Caxton's 'Booke of th' enseygnements and techynge that the knyght of the Tower made to his daughters,' translated from the French in 1483, affords an apt illustration. The extract shows, "how a woman ought to obey her husband in all things honest:"—

"I wold ye knewe wel the tale and example of the lady, which daygned not to come to her dyner for any commaundement that her lord coud make to her, and so many time he sent for her, that at the last whaune he sawe she wold not come at his commaundement he made to com before hym his swyneherd, he that kept his swynes, whiche was foule and overmuch hydous, and bad him fetch the clowte of the keechyn, wherwith men wype dysshes and platers. And thenne he made a table or bord to be dressed before hys wyf, and made it to be couerd with the said clowte, and commaunded to his swyneherd to sitte besyde her, and thenne he sayd thus to her, Lady, yf ye ne wylle ete with me, ne come to me, ne come at my commaundement, ye shalle have the keper of my swyne to hold you company and good felauship, and this clowte to wype your handes with al. And whenne she that thenne was sore ashamed and more wrath than she was tofore sawe and knew that her lord mocked her, refreyned her proud herte and knewe her foly. Therefor a woman ought not in no wyse to refuse to come at the commaundement of her lord yf she wylle have and kepe his love and pees. And also by good reason humylyte ought to come fyrste to the woman, for ever she ought to shewe herself meke and humble toward her lord."

From this specimen, by comparing it with others given in previous pages, the reader will perceive that the language used at the close of this period had made great advances in refinement, and that, with the exception of some differences in orthography, it differed but little from the present language of England.

The progress of learning in Scotland was more marked during this period than in England. While its lamp burnt more dimly in the south than in past times it shone brighter in the north. Hitherto no temple dedicated to learning had been founded in that land of mountain and flood. Not that there had not existed a taste for learning among the youth of Scotland, and a desire among the nobles that their sons should receive an education suitable to their rank. It was otherwise; for having no university of their own, the youth of Scotland had hitherto been sent into other countries to prosecute their studies. The want of a collegiate establishment within the borders had long been felt; but the distracted state of the country, which was involved in almost incessant wars, had up to this period prevented the supply of that want. At length, however, in the year 1410, a few men of letters formed themselves into a voluntary society, and generously offered to teach those sciences usually taught in universities to all who chose to attend their lectures. The names of these men, which deserve to be had in grateful remembrance by the people of Scotland, were Laurence Lindores, who read lectures on the fourth book of the sentences of Peter Lombard; John Lilster, canon of St. Andrew's, John Shevez, official of St. Andrew's, and William Stephen, who lectured on the civil and canon laws; and John Gyll, William Fowler, and William Crosier, who taught logic and philosophy. Crowds of students attended the lectures of these generous educators, and in effect, if not in form, they had established a university. As such Wardlaw, bishop of St. Andrew's, speaks of the institution in a charter of grants and privileges which he hastened to bestow upon it. That charter was granted "to the venerable doctors, masters, bachelors, and students, residing in his city of St. Andrew's, and their successors, confirming the university there, which they had so laudably instituted and begun, constituting and declaring it to be an university for the study of divinity, law, medicine, and the liberal arts, and taking it under his special protection. Wardlaw next proceeded to endow the members of his university with all the powers, privileges, and immunities usually granted to other universities; and obliged the aldermen, bailiffs, and other officers of the city of St. Andrew's to take an oath before the rector of the university not to invade or violate any of those privileges. In the same charter, the prior and chapter of St. Andrew's, with the archdeacons of St. Andrew's and Lothian, gave their consent to the establishment of the university, and granted the same privileges to its members in all their baronies and lands. But as no university could be legally founded in those times without the approbation of the sovereign pontiff, the charter, with petitions for its confirmation, were sent to Pope Benedict XIII., one of the three contending Popes of that period, who resided at Aragon, and was acknowledged by that kingdom and by Scotland. Benedict readily listened to the prayers of the petitions. Several bulls were issued by him confirming the charter. These bulls were dated on the 25th of August, 1413, and they profess to be granted at the prayer of James I., then a prisoner in England, and of the bishop, prior, and chapter of St. Andrew's, whose project of establishing a university is expressly stated

to have been formed with the counsel, consent, and participation of the three estates of the realm of Scotland. These bulls, when brought to St. Andrew's, were received with every possible demonstration of joy—with processions and the ringing of the bells in every steeple in the city. From that time the university of St. Andrew's acquired a considerable influence in the most important affairs both of Church and State. When, ten years later, James I. returned from his long exile in England to take possession of his throne, he found the university of St. Andrew's in a flourishing condition. That monarch who, in his solitude had become one of the most learned men of his age, who had drank deeply the waters of the fountain of knowledge, who had learned, in his adversity, the priceless value of learning, gave this first university in his dominions his warmest support. Many marks of his favour were bestowed upon its members. He honoured their public acts and disputations with his presence; bestowed ecclesiastical dignities and benefices on its most eminent professors; and granted them a charter which exempted them from all rolls, taxes, and services in all parts of the kingdom. Boethius says that it flourished so greatly under his patronage that it had in his days thirteen doctors of divinity, eight doctors of laws, and a numerous body of students. As yet, however, the university of St. Andrew's was both ill accommodated and poorly endowed. But Wardlaw's successor in the see, the good Bishop Kennedy, carried on with a liberal hand the noble work he had commenced. Kennedy erected a college for theology and the liberal arts, to which he gave the name of St. Salvator's College, and which he dedicated to the honour of God, of our Saviour, and the Virgin Mary. And he not only erected the fabric and defrayed the expense of its furniture, and of the utensil and ornaments of the chapel—he also endowed it with competent revenues for a principal, six fellows, and as many poor scholars. The original foundation charter of the college of St. Salvator was confirmed by Pope Nicholas V. in a bull dated the 25th of March, 1455; and a second charter, granted by Kennedy, which differed considerably from the original, was confirmed by Pope Pius II. on the 5th of April, 1458. In this second charter the whole scheme of the establishment is detailed with great minuteness, and a complete body of rules, too lengthy for enumeration, laid down for its government. The good bishop is said to have been a great reformer of the manners of the clergy; but from one of his ordinances he does not appear to have expected or exacted any extraordinary degree of purity and strictness from the members of his college. There is a strange laxity of morality displayed in that ordinance. Having given some solemn directions as to the hours at which masses were to be said throughout all time by the members of the college, all of whom were to be clergymen, he enjoined all the said members to live decently as became ecclesiastics; that is, the ordinance explains, they were "not to keep concubines publicly, nor to be common nightwalkers, or robbers, or habitually guilty of other notorious crimes." If the college ever contained such sinners, the superior was empowered by the charter to correct them; and if correction failed to produce an amendment, to expel them, and substitute others in their offices. At a later date, 1458, Pope Paul II. granted to the principal and masters of St. Salvator's College the right of bestowing degrees both in theology and the arts—that right being granted, it is expressly stated, in consideration of its well known and high reputation."

During this period another of the Scottish universities, that of Glasgow, was founded. The originator of this second university was William Turnbull, bishop of the diocese. Turnbull prevailed upon James II. to apply to the Pope for erecting one in that city, representing that it would not only be of use to his own subjects, but also to the people of some neighbouring countries. Nicholas V., who was then Pope, readily complied with the application. The bull of foundation was granted on the 26th of December, A.D. 1450—William, bishop of Glasgow, and his successors being constituted perpetual chancellors of the university. At subsequent dates, other royal and episcopal charters were granted. Thus, on the 20th of April, A.D. 1453, James II., by his letters patent under the great seal, took under his special protection all the members of the university, from the rector to the parchment-makers, exempting them from all taxes, tolls, watchings, wardings, &c., within his kingdom. In the same year, on the 1st of December, Turnbull, the chief promoter of the institution, granted a charter containing a variety of powers and privileges conferred by him on the rector and university; those powers and privileges being counterparts of those granted by Wardlaw to his university of St. Andrew's. But the most munificent patrons of the university of Glasgow were James, lord Hamilton, and his lady Euphemia, countess of Douglas, from whom it received its first valuable benefaction, which gave it a solid foundation and lasting establishment. By a charter, dated the 6th of January, A.D. 1459, they granted to the regents and students and their successors for ever a tenement on the east side of the street leading from the cathedral to the market-cross, for their accommodation, together with four acres of ground adjacent, on the site of which tenement the present college is erected. This appears to be an almost isolated instance of property being given for residence to universities, by charter, prior to the date of the reformation; for it does not appear that it was the intention of founders of universities that the members should live *collegialiter*, maintained at a public table, and resident within the walls of a separate building. Universities were often established without having even class-rooms for the students. The university of Paris, for instance, for nearly five hundred years after it was founded, had neither schools nor places of auditory except such as were hired in the houses of individuals. And of the university of St. Andrew's it has been observed that, during the first twenty years after its foundation, great inconvenience was suffered, not only from the want of such rooms, but from the multiplicity of schools in the different religious houses, all of which claimed to be constituent parts of the university. Even after a Pædagogium was founded, in 1430, for the schools and halls of the faculty of arts, and for chambers to be used by the students in that faculty, the studies of the faculties of theology

and law were conducted in other buildings; and the congregations of the university continued for at least 130 years to be held in the Augustine priory." The gift, therefore, of a tenement for the rectors and students of the Glasgow university to reside in, and live in a collegiate manner, was a peculiarly graceful act, and well deserved the return the donors required of them—namely, that they should every day, after dinner and supper, stand up and pray, and during every year say a great number of masses for the good of the souls of their benefactors.

SECTION II.

Architecture.—"All that is fair must fade." In our last article on architecture we have shown that the beautiful style called Gothic had reached its sublimest developments; in this we have to speak of its decline. The great artists of this age were not content to let well alone. Finding, perhaps, that they could rise no higher, that they could not add to the stern beauty and consummate grandeur of the continental Gothic, they set to work "to gild refined gold;" and the consequence was a failure. The style which was superadded to it did not harmonize with its grandeur; for as no ornaments could improve the works of a Phidias, so could no ornaments improve the Gothic style of architecture. And yet this was the very thing at which the artists of the fifteenth century tried their skill. A style sprang up, of which the distinctive characteristic was,—decoration; the result of which was the gradual degradation and ruin of the order to which both belonged. Yet, says an acute writer, "in that ruin the Gothic, like a dying flower, scattered abroad the seeds of a vigorous progeny, which under the name of the Tudor domestic architecture, forms, to this day, the most valuable of all styles for general purposes, which combines at once all the qualities that can be desired for the largest or the smallest public or private building—ecclesiastical edifices excepted—which in a word will give us the sumptuous magnificence of the Houses of Parliament, or the picturesque comfort of the suburban or roadside cottage with its bay window and gabled roof."

This new style of architecture has been variously designated the Tudor, the Horizontal, the Florid, and the Perpendicular Gothic. It is by this latter name that the style is generally spoken of in scientific works; and the term is derived from the perpendicular direction of the mullions or slender strips of stone that divide the windows longitudinally, and the panellings that so largely decorate all otherwise vacant spaces of wall. But if all the other features of this new style are taken into consideration, namely, the increased expansion of the windows, the embattled transoms, the gorgeous tracery of the fan roofs, the vast pendants suspended in mid air, and the luxuriance of heraldic emblazonry that enriched the buildings, the term florid is the most expressive and appropriate. The effect of the combination of all these qualities may be seen in Henry VII.'s chapel at Westminster, King's College, Cambridge; and St. George's chapel, Windsor. That of King's College, Cambridge, begun in the reign of Henry VI., and finished in that of Henry VII., is considered to be the most perfect specimen of this new style of architecture. The decoration is gorgeous. With the exception of the floor the whole is one mass of panelling in every conceivable form. The very entrance door-way is one of elaborate splendour, and as for its painted windows and its roof,



DOORWAY, KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

which is composed entirely of arches of the most airy and indestructible construction, and covered with exquisite fan-like tracery, they are splendid beyond imagination. Eton College and chapel also affords another specimen of this style of architecture, which, as before seen, was founded by Henry VI. as a preparatory school to King's College, Cambridge.

ETON COLLEGE.

Some idea may be formed of the richness of the decorations in ecclesiastical edifices from some bills of expenses which have been preserved, relating to

Beauchamp chapel, Warwick, a chapel that had been devised by Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, who died in 1439, and which was erected by his executors. These accounts do not refer to the raising of the structure, which is of exquisite proportions, but to the interior adornments. One amount has reference only to the stained glass windows. It reads thus:—"John Prudde, of Westminster, glazier, on the 23rd June, in 25 Henry V., covenanteth to glaze all the windows in the new chapel in Warwick with glass beyond the seas, and with no glass of England: and that in the finest wise, with the best, cleanest, and strongest glass of beyond the sea, that may be had in England, and of the finest colours, blue, yellow, red, purpure, sanguine, and violet, and of all other colours that shall be most necessary, and best to make rich and embellish the matters, images, and stories, that shall be delivered and appointed by the said executors, by patterns in paper; afterwards to be newly traced and pictured by another painter in rich colours at the charges of the said glazier; all which proportions the said John Prudde must make perfectly, to fine glaze, anneal it, and finely and strongly set it in leade and sorder, as well as any glass is in England. Of white glass, green glass, black glass, he shall put in as little as be needful for the showing and setting forth of the matters, images, and stories. And the said glazier shall take charge of the same glass, wrought, and to be brought to Warwick and set up there, in the windows of the said chapel, the executors paying to the said glazier for every foot of glass 2*s.*, and so for the whole 91*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.*" The next agreement was with the carpenter for desks, poppies, seats, sills, planks, an organ loft, &c. Then came the painter. One John Brentwood, citizen and stainer, of London, on the 12th of Feb., 28 Henry VI., "covenanted to paint fine and curiously, to make at Warwick, on the west wall of the new chapel there, the doom of Our Lord God Jesus, and all manner of devices and imagery thereto belonging, of fair and sightly proportion, as the place shall serve for, with the finest colours and fine gold; and the said Brentwood shall find all manner of stuff thereto at his charge, the said executors paying therefore 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*" But there was another painter of the sculpture, Kristine Coleburn, of London, who, on the 13th June, 32 Henry VI., "covenanted to paint in most fine, fairest, and curious wise, four images of stone, ordained for the new chapel in Warwick, the one of Our Lady, the other of St. Gabriel the angel, and two less images, one of St. Ann, and another of St. George: these four to be painted with the finest oil colours, in the richest, finest, and freshest clothings that may be made of fine gold, azure, of fine purpure, of fine white and other finest colours necessary, garnished, bordered, and powdered in the finest and curiousest wise; all the cost and workmanship of painting to be at the charge of the said Kristine, the executors paying for the same, 12*l.*" Next follows two marblers, one undertaking to erect a tomb and the adjoining part of the chapel pavement, and the other with a founder and coppersmith who agreed to provide the metal ornaments, and the latten plates for the tomb, consisting of one large plate and two narrow ones to go round the tomb, with hearse, shields of arms, inscriptions, &c., which were to be gilded with the finest gold; the whole to be executed for 125*l.* But the tomb was not yet completed. William Austin "covenanted to cast work, and perfectly to make, of the finest latten, to be gilded that may be found, viz., images embossed of lords and ladies in divers vestures, called weepers, to stand in housings made about the tombs, those images to be made in breadth, length, and thickness, &c., to fourteen patterns made of wood." Austin also "covenanted to make eighteen less images to stand in other housings, as shall be appointed by patterns, whereof nine after one side and nine after another. Also he must make a hearse to stand on the tomb, above and about the principal image that shall lie in the tomb, according to a pattern, the stuff and workmanship to the repairing to be at the charge of the said Will Austin. And the executors shall pay for every image that shall lie on the tomb, of the weepers so made in latten, 13*s.* 4*d.*, and for every image of angels so made, 5*s.*; and for every pound of latten that shall be in the hearse, 10*d.*, and shall pay and bear the costs of the said Austin for setting the said images and hearse." One thing now only was wanting, and Beauchamp chapel would then be complete. This was the effigy of the deceased earl, its founder; and Austin covenanted for 40*l.* to cast and make an image of a man armed, of fine latten, garnished with certain ornaments, viz., with sword and dagger, with a garter, with a helm and crest under his head, and at his feet a bear muzzled, and a griffon perfectly made of the finest latten, according to patterns." It is singular that while the accounts thus minutely describe the workmen employed in executing the patterns no mention is made of the artist who formed them. The total cost of this chapel and monument was 2481*l.* 4*s.* 7*d.*, equivalent to 24,800*l.* of our present money.

At this time castles such as had been erected under the Norman kings were no longer needed, except on the Welsh and Scottish borders. Those that existed were maintained in all their strength and majesty, and additions were made to them in accordance with their original style; but there were also added spacious courts rich with "fair-compassed windows," within the space protected by the broad moat and loopholed tower. The castles built within this period, however, were of a different construction: uniting the characters of castellated and domestic architecture. These castellated mansions were often highly ornamented, and generally enclosed quadrangular court-yards. Such were Herstmonceaux, in Sussex, built by Lord Say and Sele in 1448, and Tattershall, in Lincolnshire, erected by Lord Treasurer Cromwell in 1455. The principal interior feature of these noble residences was the great hall, shaped as a parallelogram, large and lofty, with the timbers of the roofs shaped into huge pendants, elaborately carved, and emblazoned with heraldic insignia. That of Herstmonceaux had seventeen octagon towers and a machicolated gateway, and was therefore warlike in appearance; but in some of these buildings, and perhaps in this also, there was more the appearance than the reality of strength. Licenses were often granted to embattle and fortify manor-houses; but the decorated gable and the handsome oriel window superseded, to a great

extent, the protecting parapet and frowning embrasure. The great hall was still the distinguishing feature of the domestic arrangement: the owner dining there with his retainers, domestics, and guests. But the great houses of this age were not erected with much regard for domestic comfort. There was a greater number of lodging rooms and offices, but they were ill provided with living rooms as compared with the mansions of the present day. Elaborate decorations and spacious painted windows were more highly prized than convenience and comfort. The great hall was a splendid room; but the apartments around and above were generally of a primitive character, having neither wood linings nor plaster ceilings. Even the doors and windows were ill closed, and tapestry and hangings were still used for the double purpose of decorating the walls and keeping the wind out. This was more especially the case with the ordinary country dwellings of the proprietary classes, which were constructed upon the same fashion as the castellated mansions, that is, with an open court and a hall. Most of these houses were built of timber; for though the building with brick, which had been disused for centuries, was now revived, it was by no means common. In some cases it would appear, that houses were framed upon the spot where wood was felled; but in populous districts it was sometimes procured from a distance. This is evident from a passage in the Paston Letters, where it is stated by the lady who wrote it, that if she should sell her "woods now, there will no man give so much for them by near an hundred marks as they be worth, because there be so many wood sales in Norfolk at this time."

The quantity of timber used in the erection of some of the great manor-houses was enormous. That of Eltham, rebuilt by Edward IV., affords an apt illustration of this fact. Mr. Buckler observes of the hall:—"The interior is magnificent. The taste and talent of ages are concentrated in its design; and it is scarcely possible to imagine proportions more just and noble, a plan more perfect, ornaments more appropriate and beautiful; in a word, a whole more harmonious than this regal banqueting room. The main beams of the roof are full seventeen inches square, and twenty-eight feet long, perfectly straight and sound throughout, and are the produce of trees of the most stately growth. A forest must have yielded the choicest timber for the supply of this building; and it is evident that the material has been wrought with incredible labour and skill."

Descending from the higher classes to the lower, the transition is almost direct from the mansion to the hovel. There were few intermediate dwellings except in towns. The home of a country gentleman was of scanty dimensions and mean appearance; while that of the yeoman and peasant was a chimneyless dwelling of rough rafters or clay. Burghers had a better class of tenements; some being substantially built of wood and some of stone. As for opulent merchants, they were perhaps better provided with comfortable homes than the lords of castles. Stow says of the house erected by Sir John Crosby, an alderman of London in 1466, that it "was very large and beautiful, and the highest at that time in the city."

HOUSES OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Existing remains in some of the provincial towns of England, prove that in the fifteenth century there was universally a refined taste in the art of street architecture. But it would appear that this taste

was spent more upon the exterior, like that of castellated mansions, than on the interior. Agnes Paston, writing of her lord's town house of Norwich, which was probably built of stone, and exhibited an architectural taste without, intimates that she was puzzled how she could put her husband's writing board and his coffer beside the bed so that he could have space to sit to write: an inconvenience to which few even of the humbler classes who use the pen are now called upon to endure.

Sculpture.—Sculpture during this period arrived to greater perfection than had yet been known in England. The sculptor's art was popular. They were more employed and better rewarded for their works in this than in any former period. Ecclesiastical edifices abounded with their productions. But it was not in the images of saints that their skill was so much displayed as in sepulchral monuments. Altar or altar-tombs, with effigies of the departed recumbent upon them, were erected at great cost; some of which, as that of Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, before noticed, were placed beneath stately canopies, and placed in inclosures sufficiently capacious to serve as chapels for celebrating masses for the deceased. These recumbent effigies exhibit highly advanced art in their execution, and are valuable as portraits of the deceased, preserving the distinction of costume, profession, and office. The monarch appears in his regal attire; the prelate with his mitre, crozier, and pontificals; the knight with his helmet and coat of mail; and the noble lady with delicate wimple, flowing drapery, and banded hair. The most elaborate Gothic art is displayed in some of these chantries; that of Henry V., at the eastern extremity of Westminster Abbey, being the most perfect specimen.



CHANTRY OF HENRY V., WESTMINSTER.

Scarcely any person of rank died in this age whose memory was not perpetuated by a monument with his effigies in free stone, marble, or metal upon; it so that artists had full employment for their talent, which could not fail in bringing their art to considerable perfection. Many of these memorials are, indeed, extremely elegant and elaborate, both in design and execution.

Painting.—With the exception of decorative painting, this art was not in a flourishing condition. Few portraits were painted in this period, and those that were display no peculiar skill. Almost the only painting patronized was what is called herald painting; and that did not receive very liberal patronage. It is recorded that the earl of Warwick employed his tailor for the painter's work to be displayed in the pageantry of his embassy to France; and that, tailor-like, he used eleven yards of paint in length and eight in breadth to represent the streamer of the ship in which the great earl sailed. One of the most celebrated paintings of this age was the "Dance of Death," painted in the cloister of St. Paul's, at the expense of John Carpenter, town clerk of London; but its celebrity chiefly arises from the circumstance, that it was the original of that subsequently painted by the famous Holbein. This painting contained the figures of persons in all the different ranks of life, dressed in the costume of the age, and was painted in imitation of one of the same kind in the cloister adjoining to St. Innocent's churchyard in Paris. But the real painters of this, as in the previous period, were the illuminators of manuscript, whose works, though less rich in purple and gold than those of the fourteenth century, are frequently very accurately and tastefully executed. The illuminations of this age consist of a variety of natural objects; and they give us not only faithful portraits of kings, princes, prelates, and nobles, but also a view of their costume, customs, manners, arts, and employment; and of their arms, ships, houses, and furniture. This delicate art of illuminating was chiefly cultivated by the monks, and many beautiful specimens of the art are still preserved in rare public and private libraries.

Poetry.—Although there were numerous writers of verse in this period there were but few poets. The illustrious fathers of English poetry—Chaucer and Gower—died at its commencement; and after their death the divine art of poesy languished. The only three deserving of mention in the page of history, are Thomas Occleve, John Lydgate, and James I. of Scotland, all of whom profess to have taken Chaucer for their model; but none of whom touched the harp with such skilful fingers as their great master in song.

Occleve is the first known writer of any considerable quantity of verse after Chaucer. He flourished in the reign of Henry V.: Warton places him about the year 1420. He seems to have been personally acquainted with Chaucer, and to have received instructions from him in poetry, for he frequently laments his death in his productions. Thus, in one passage he writes:—

"My dere mayster, God his soul quite
And fader Chaucer fayne would have me taught;
But I was dule, and learned lyte or naught.

Alas! my worthy mayster honourable,
This lands very treasure and richese,
Deth by thy deth hathe harme irreparable
Unto us done."

Occleve composed a considerable number of poems, but only a few of them have been thought worthy of publication. Dr. Askew selected and published six of them in 1796, and Ritson pays him the compliment of having made his choice for their "peculiar stupidity." His real character as a poet has been thus described with great justice by Warton:—"Occleve is a feeble writer considered as a poet; and his chief merit seems to be, that his writings contributed to propagate and establish those improvements in our language which were now beginning to take place. His works indicate a coldness of genius; and, on the whole, promise no gratification to those who seek for invention and fancy."

John Lydgate, who was a monk in the great Benedictine monastery of St. Edmundsbury, was the most famous versifier of the fifteenth century. Ritson attributes above two hundred and fifty poems to his muse. His principal works printed were these four:—'The Life of our Lady,' 'The Fall of Princes,' 'The Siege of Thebes,' and 'The Destruction of Troy.' His chief excellencies are the smoothness of his versification, and the strength, beauty, and copiousness of his descriptions, in which his works abound. The language of Lydgate makes a nearer approach to modern English than that of any preceding writer. As an example, we give his description of himself from his life and death of Hector:—

I am a monk by my profession,
In Berry called John Lydgate by my name,
And wear a habit of perfection,
Although my life agree not with the same,
That meddle should with things spirituall,
As I must needs confess unto you all.

But seeing that I did herein proceed
At his command [Henry V.] whom I could not refuse,
I humbly do beseech all those that read
Or leisure have, this story to peruse:
If any fault therein they find to be
Or error, that committed is by me.

That they will of their gentleness take pain
The rather to correct and mend the same,
Than rashly to condemn it with disdain,
For well I wot it is not without blame;
Because I know the verse therein is wrong
As being some too short and some too long.

For Chaucer, that my master was, and knew
What did belong to writing verse and prose,
Ne'er stumbled at small faults, nor yet did view
With scornful eye the works and books of those
That in his time did write, nor yet would daunt
At any man, to fear him or to taunt.

Lydgate was a general scholar as well as poet. He had travelled in France and Italy and was acquainted with all the learning of the times in which he flourished. It was said of him that he was an eloquent rhetorician, an expert mathematician, an acute philosopher, and no mean divine. But if we may believe the epitaph which was inscribed upon his tomb in the convent of St. Edmundsbury, he was more famous as a poet than for any other branch of learning. It reads thus:—

Dead in this world, living above the sky,
Entomb'd within this urn doth Lydgate lie,
In former time famed for his poetry
All over England.

But, however popular Lydgate might have been, the laurel crown must be awarded to James I., king of Scotland, for poetic genius, both as regards originality and the powers of invention. Of his principal work, 'The King's Quair,' it has been observed with truth that there is nothing in English poetry so elegant and tender from the time of Chaucer to that of Spenser. This poem was written while a captive in England in honour of Lady Jane Beaufort, his beautiful mistress, and afterwards his queen. Few ladies have had so fine a poem composed in their praise by either a royal or plebeian lover as the Lady Jane. It consists of six cantos, in every part of which there is displayed a vivid imagination, richness of expression and invention, and true poetic genius. The story of his love is described in the form of a dream, in which he imagines himself transported in a bright cloud to the planet Venus, and admitted into the palace of the queen of Love. Having heard his pathetic tale, Venus promised her aid, and sends him under the conduct of Good Hope to Minerva for advice. Having reached the palace of Minerva, that goddess, finding the love he described to her to be sincere, virtuous, and honourable, among other counsels advises him to—

Pray fortune help; for suich unlikely thing
Full oft about she sodeynly dooth bring.

Having descended from the celestial palace of Minerva to his native earth, the poet, under the guidance of Good Hope, sets out in quest of Fortune, and after travelling through a beautiful country, which is described in rich poetical language, he found the goddess sitting on the ground, dressed in a parti-coloured robe, sometimes frowning, sometimes smiling, with her wheel before her, from which he saw many fall headlong into a pit from which few emerged. Fortune smiled on the royal lover for having implored the aid of the goddess; she bade him mount her wheel boldly, and to stand firm and hold fast; but in assisting him to mount he says,

She by the ere me toke
So earnestly, that therewithall I woke.

The royal poet now describes his painful perplexity as to whether what had passed was a vain dream or a real vision, which could afford him any solid hope. But he was soon relieved. Walking to the window of his prison a "turture white as calk" alighted upon his hand, with a stalk of gilliflowers in her beak, on the leaves of the flowers of which were written:—

Awake! awake! I bring enfar, I bring
The newis glad, that blisful ben and sure
Of thy consort: now lauch, and play, and sing,
Thou art besid so glad an aventure;
For in the hevyn decretit is thy cure.

The royal lover's blank despair under which he commenced his love tale is now turned into unmitigated joy. There are few love poems in the English language so rich in poetic fancy as 'The King's Quair,' written by this poet king. It is believed that James wrote many minor pieces, most of which have perished. By some he is supposed to have written "Christ's

Kirk of the Green,' and 'Peebles to the Play;' but the best critics attribute them to his descendant, James V., who was equally gifted and equally unfortunate as his royal parent. But whichever wrote them, they possess no small degree of merit for wit and humour.

Music.—If music did not attain to any great perfection in this period, it was considerably improved. It began, indeed, to partake somewhat of the form of modern melody and harmony. The hero of Agincourt had his band with him when in France, who played on ten clarions and other instruments an hour both morning and evening at his head-quarters. Henry was also a devoted admirer of church-music, and a performer on the organ, as was his more accomplished contemporary, James I. of Scotland. Church music was cultivated with great care; for it was through the ear as well as the eye that the clergy endeavoured to captivate the people. Grand processions and sweet sounds served their purpose better than preaching and teaching. In cathedrals and conventual churches, and in the chapels of kings, prelates, and great barons, there were choirs of men and boys who daily sang the service to the sound of the organ. And ecclesiastical music was not merely practised as an art, it was studied as a science. It was one of the four sciences which constituted the quadrivium of the schools, and was studied with greater avidity than the other three—namely, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. The youths of the universities, if designed for the church studied music with the view of obtaining the academical honours of bachelors and doctors: those who obtained them being morally certain of obtaining preferment. Thus, in the year 1463, Thomas Saintwik, Mus. Doc., was appointed by Henry VI. to his newly-founded college at Cambridge, as its provost. The chief study of musical students was counterpoint, which was now first invented, but as yet very imperfectly understood. This new branch of music furnished an ample field for exercising their genius and industry. Numerous tracts were written thereon, and many pieces of this new music were composed for the church, but very few of them have been preserved. John Tinctor and Franchinus, writers on music in this period, ascribe this new art to John of Dunstable; but this appears to be erroneous. There is evidence that John of Dunstable, who died A.D. 1458, was at the head of the musicians of his time, but counterpoint was invented before his birth, and was not of English origin. As regards the minstrelsy of the period, if Warton is correct, it was in a very flourishing condition, minstrels being paid much higher for their services than priests. That some minstrels became wealthy there can be no doubt, but that all were highly paid may be questioned. Down to the reign of Edward IV. the profession appears to have partaken somewhat of a vagrant character. As a rule, minstrels were neither so highly honoured nor so richly rewarded as they had formerly been. Those who excelled in their art, however, were still much respected. Both kings and nobles had bands of them in their service, having board, clothing, and wages allowed them for the amusement they afforded; but it seems clear that their pay was not over liberal, for they were often permitted to perform in rich monasteries and in the castles of less wealthy barons than their masters, to increase their remuneration. In the year 1469, the minstrel profession was chartered by Edward IV., and then it was that the profession became an honourable one. The guild or fraternity was governed by a marshal and two wardens, and ample powers were given to the corporation for correcting the disorders, and regulating the affairs of the minstrels.

CHAPTER V.

The History of Industry and Commerce, from A.D. 1399 to A.D. 1485.

SECTION I.

Agriculture.—DURING the thirteenth century, agriculture had been the great object of attention. In the popular estimation it was then considered to have been essentially connected with the welfare of the realm. During the present period, however, the tillage of the land was by no means in a flourishing condition. But there were causes for this decline. In the first place, the wars of the period took numbers from the plough into the field of battle to fight and die; and in the next, those villains who had obtained their emancipation, on recovering their freedom betook themselves to handicrafts and manufactures, as being more remunerative than agriculture. The value of wool, also, which rendered flocks more profitable than corn and grain, had the effect of diminishing the quantity of arable land—much of it being turned into pasture ground. It has been seen that in the preceding century there was a scarcity of labour arising from the emancipation of many of the villains, and that certain statutes were passed to remedy the want. But these statutes had no effect. The scarcity of labourers rather increased than diminished, war adding tenfold to their diminution. Besides this, there was no encouragement given to the peasantry to continue their labours in the field. On the contrary, they might be said to have been driven from the plough by statute law: although the design of the legislature was to bind them to its handle. Thus, in the year 1405, a new statute was passed which provided that no person of whatever estate should put his son or daughter, of whatever age, apprentice to any craft or other labour within any city or borough, except he had land or rent to the value of twenty shillings a year at least; but they should be put to other labours, that is, of the field, as their estates required, upon pain of one year's imprisonment, and to

make fine and ransom at the king's will. It was also enacted, that whoever had followed the plough till he was twelve years of age, should continue to follow it to old age. If the legislature had provided that the peasant should receive his just hire for his labours, this infringement on man's natural liberty might not have proved burdensome; although even then, by no process of reasoning, could such rigorous legislative enactments be justified. But the case was far different. The farm labourer was to work for so much and no more. A statute, fixing the price of labour, which passed in 1444, declared that "such as deserved less should take less," and that "also in places where less was used to be given, less should still be given." The wages thus fixed were for the year, and except common servants in husbandry, they included meat and drink. The wages fixed by this statute were, for a bailiff, 23*s.* 4*d.* and 5*s.* for clothing; for a chief hind, carter, or shepherd, 20*s.* and 4*s.* for clothing; for a woman servant, 10*s.* and 4*s.* for clothing; and for a boy under fourteen, 6*s.* and 3*s.* for clothing. All these had their meat and drink, but the common servant was doomed by this statute to labour for 15*s.* and 40*d.* for clothing—and for less if he did not deserve so much—and find his own diet. In harvest, it was provided that some additional pay should be given; but it was miserably deficient, so that all the year round there was no encouragement for the peasantry to continue their labours in the field. Hence, in spite of the enactments to bind them to agricultural pursuits and to regulate the price of labour, the deficiency of labourers continued to be felt, until at length it produced a complete revolution in the state of agriculture.

It was about the middle of this century that the practice of enclosing and converting arable land into pasture grounds became general; the primary causes for which practice being the scarcity of hands to till the ground and the increasing value of wool, which made it more profitable to keep flocks of sheep than to grow bread-stuffs. This enclosure of lands appears to have caused considerable commotion. John Rouse, of Warwick, in his history of the period, bitterly declaims against the nobility and gentry for enclosing their lands; denouncing them as depopulators, destroyers of villages, robbers, tyrants, basilisks, enemies to God and man; men, he says, who would be sure to go to the devil when they died. Rouse says that he presented a petition to parliament, in 1459, against the practice, which was disregarded, and that other petitions subsequently presented to parliament at different dates, had been uniformly rejected. But Rouse could not have been an acute observer; for if he had examined into the causes of this practice, he must have seen that it mainly arose from a decay of population. This is distinctly set forth in an Act which passed in the first year of Henry II. against pulling down of towns, in which it was declared that "where in some towns two hundred persons were occupied and lived by their lawful labours, now be there occupied two or three herdmen." But Rouse was not the only superficial observer at this period. The grievance to which this decay of population was ascribed was the conversion of tilled land into pasture, and the consolidation of farms and farmholds "into one man's hold and hands, that of old time were wont to be in several persons hold and hands, and many several households kept in them, and thereby much people multiplied." The belief that the conversion of arable into pasture land was the cause of the late "decay of people," and not that this late decay was the cause of that conversion seems, indeed, to have long survived the period. More partook of that belief, for he bitterly complains of the process of converting arable into pasture land. Addressing a noble of that time, he relates that he expressed himself thus:—"Forsooth, my lord, your sheep that were wont to be so meek and tame, and so small eaters, now, as I hear say, be become so great devourers and so wild, that they eat up and swallow down the very men themselves. They consume, destroy, and devour whole fields, houses, and cities; for look in what parts of the realm doth grow the finest and the dearest wool, these noblemen and gentlemen, yea, and certain abbots, holy men ne doubt, not contenting themselves with the yearly revenues and profits that were wont to grow to their forefathers and predecessors of their lands, nor being content that they live in rest and pleasure, nothing profiting, yea, much noying the weal public, leave no ground for tillage. They inclose all into pastures, they throw down houses, they pluck down towns, and leave nothing standing, but only the church to be made a sheep-house. And as though you lost no small quantity of ground by forests, chases, lands, and parks, those good holy men turn all dwelling-places and all glebe land into desolation and wilderness."

This wholesale conversion of arable into pasture lands, notwithstanding the decay of population, had the effect of raising the price of corn in this period. The frequent dearths, also, which occurred tended to the same result. In the present age, if corn is double its ordinary price, it is severely felt by the great body of the people; but in the fifteenth century it was sometimes three or four, and even more, times the price than it had been in the preceding period. The most common price of a quarter of wheat was 4*s.* or 4*s.* 6*d.*, equivalent to 40*s.* or 45*s.* of present money. In the years 1437-8, however, it was still higher; the price of a quarter being in some places 1*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, equal to 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* of present money, or at about the price which corn fetched during some years of the great continental wars in the early part of the present century. But at this time, if wheat was 6*s.* 8*d.* per quarter, it appears to have been considered a low price, for in 1436 it was enacted that when it sold for that sum it might be carried out of the realm without licence, an enactment which was renewed for ten years in 1441, and made perpetual in 1444. On the other hand, if wheat was ever less than 6*s.* 8*d.* per quarter, by a corn law passed A.D. 1463, no grain was to be allowed to be imported into the country. This law appears to have been necessary to prevent the ruin of those who still grew corn, for of late years there had been an extraordinary importation of corn from the continent, in order to procure a supply of English wool, which had reduced the price of wheat to 2*s.* per quarter. When it is considered that the average produce of an acre of wheat did not exceed six bushels, or little more than a quarter, it is natural to suppose that complaints were made by growers

that if foreign corn was allowed to be imported in such quantities as to reduce the price to so low a figure, they could not cultivate their lands, and that, on such complaints, its importation was prohibited.

Concerning the value of land at this period there is no precise information. In the reign of Edward III., some land appears to have fetched twenty five years' purchase, while, in the reign of Edward IV., it is inferred, from the reward offered by him for the apprehension of his brother, the duke of Clarence, or the earl of Warwick in 1470—namely, either 100*l.* per annum in land, or 1,000*l.* in ready money, land was then worth only ten years' purchase. But it must be remembered that this monarch, from the numerous confiscations of the estates of the adherents of the House of Lancaster, was rich in lands, and, at the same time, as his constant habit of borrowing proves, poor in money. At the same time, land might have been thus reduced in value, for the circumstances of the times were such as to render the tenure of lands very uncertain. It is even probable that land was worth much less than ten years' purchase, for Sir John Fortescue, advising Edward IV. to reward his servants with money rather than with land, says, "It is supposed that to some of them is given 100*l.* worth of land yearly, that would have held him content with 200*l.* in money, if they might have had it in hand." But it can hardly be imagined that land had sunk so low in value as to be worth only two years' purchase, as this advice of Fortescue's would convey; and it would rather seem that those who received rewards from Edward were more disposed to have cash in hand, than wait for the produce or the rents of the acres, however broad they might be, which he might bestow upon them. Moreover, from past experiences, they might have had an uncomfortable idea that they might not long retain possession of such bounties; for as estates had changed hands at every recent revolution, so if another revolution should take place, they might again revert to their original and rightful owners. Besides, land to let out at given rents was not of great value, for it is on record that the rent of an acre of arable land varied from sixpence to ninepence; and the abbot of Bury, in 1491, let eighteen acres of pasture land on a lease for eighty years at fourpence halfpenny an acre: expressly, however, stipulating that all the thorns growing thereon were to be extirpated within the first twelve years, otherwise the lease was to be null and void.

A Byzantine writer, reciting the observations of Manuel, emperor of Constantinople, who visited England, A.D. 1400, says, "It has no vines and but little fruit, but it abounds in corn." As regards vines, it may be true that there might be few compared with the sunny lands of the south where they abounded, but that there were none is not strictly correct. There are repeated notices of vineyards in domestic documents; and the ecclesiastical archives of Ely show that even in that northern locality the grape vine was cultivated in the reign of Edward IV. It was not, indeed, till foreign wines became more plentiful that vineyards went out of cultivation in England. That there was some attention paid to the cultivation of fruit-trees is also certain. During this period the cherry and a few varieties of plum were introduced into gardens and orchards. It is probable that the Orleans plum was brought into the country when the English held possession of that part of France. The strawberry was taken from the forests, its native site, and became a cultivated garden plant. Cherries and strawberries were hawked about the streets of London in the reign of Henry V., for Lydgate mentions, in one of his poems, the cry of—

"Straberry ripe and cherrys in the ryse."

That "my lord of Ely" had fine strawberries in his garden at Holborn in the time of Edward VI. has been seen in a previous page. Fruits appear to have been more attended to than in any previous period; and that garden ground was valuable is clear, for an acre fetched the not inconsiderable sum of ten shillings a year: fifteen or even twenty times the sum of an acre of arable land. And that the value of garden ground chiefly consisted in its fruit trees is evident, for there were no vegetables grown excepting a few cabbages and pot herbs. Pleasure-gardens were commonly attached to castle-palaces and the great abbeys, and some care and skill were displayed in their arrangement. The garden of Windsor Castle has been thus described by James I. of Scotland, who was a prisoner there about A.D. 1414.

Now was there maed fast by the touris wall
A gardyn faire, and in the corner is set
One herbere grene, with wandis long and small
Railit about; and so with treis set
Was all the place, and hawthorn hegis knet
That lyf [living persons] was now walking there fabye,
That myght within scare any wight aspye.

So think the bewis and the levis grene
Beschadet all the allyes that there were
And middis every herber might be sene
The sharp grene suete juniperre,
Growing so fair with branches here and there
That as it semyt to a lyf without
The bewis spread the herbere all about.

James, king of Scotland, seems to have studied the art of gardening when in England, for it is recorded of him when he was restored to his kingdom, that he would sometimes instruct those about him in the art of cultivating kitchen and pleasure-gardens, and of planting and ingrafting different kinds of fruit-trees.

It may be mentioned that the sowing of grasses and the raising of other food for cattle were not practised at this period. It was not even the custom to manure pastures, so that the cattle of that period, compared with the large fatted cattle of the present day, must have borne a strong resemblance to the lean kine Pharaoh saw in his dream. As regards sheep, their value chiefly consisted in their wool, for which article flocks of them were chiefly kept. In this century the price of a cow was 7*s.*; of an ox, 13*s.* 4*d.*; of a sheep, 2*s.* 5*d.*; and of a hog, 2*s.*; which is indicative rather of quantity than quality.

Printing.—It was during this period that the art of printing was discovered—an art the value of which no pen can describe. Three towns contend for the honour of having given birth to this new art—viz., Haarlem in Holland, and Mayence and Strasburgh in Germany. It would be impossible to say to which town this honour belongs; but the Germans agree in venerating three names as the fathers of this grand

invention of the middle age—John Gutenberg, Peter Schoeffer, and John Fust. The grand fundamental conception of printing with moveable types belongs to Gutenberg alone; the part Schoeffer had in the matter being the invention of casting types of metal by means of a matrix; and that of Fust, probably, as he was wealthy, being to assist Gutenberg, who was poor, with the means of carrying out his invention by the printing of some books. But this new art was for several years confined to Germany. It was not, indeed, till about thirty years had elapsed that it was introduced either into England or France. Its introduction into England is unanimously ascribed to William Caxton; and although attempts have been made to rob him of that honour, there is no doubt that he was the first printer in England. According to his own account, Caxton was born in the weald of Kent, and that when a lad he came from his native place to London as a draper's apprentice. Fortune smiled on this Kentish lad. In due time he became a merchant and citizen of London, and finally he became consul for the English merchants at Bruges. At that time the art of printing from moveable types was the wonder of all Germany, and Caxton's attention was drawn to it. Perceiving its importance as the means of spreading knowledge and dispersing the dark shades of ignorance which had so long obscured the human intellect—as an art which, when brought into universal use, would make tyranny impossible, and become a safeguard against every form of oppression and corruption—Caxton left his mercantile functions that he might study and practise the new invention. According to his own account, he acquired "at grete charge and dispense" so complete a knowledge of the new and admired art of printing, that he printed, A.D. 1471, at Cologne, a book, which he had translated out of the French into English, called 'The Recule of the Histories of Troye.' He appears to have printed this book both in French and English, and also to have printed the Latin oration of John Russel, on Charles, duke of Burgundy being created a knight of the garter, so that the productions of his foreign press exhibited his skill in three different languages. Caxton returned to England in 1472, and in the next year he set up a printing-press in London, probably in the almonry of Westminster Abbey. The first book known to have issued from his English press was 'The Game of Chess,' which he had himself translated from the French. This was quickly followed by others, so that before he died, A.D. 1491, he had published about fifty books, many of which were his own translations. Caxton lived to see the art established in England, for before his death other printing-presses were set up in London—as those of Theodore Rood, John Lettow, William Machelina, and Wynkyn de Worde—who being foreigners, had probably been brought into England by Caxton as his assistants. From its first introduction into England, the art of printing received encouragement. Caxton, indeed, lived to see its productions allowed to come into the land as freely as the light from heaven; and those who practised the art or traded in books as merchandise, not only protected but encouraged by the law, for in the reign of Richard III., among the commercial acts of that brief period was this memorable enactment:—"Provided always that this act or any part thereof, or any other act made or to be made in this present parliament, in no wise extend or be prejudicial any let, hurt, or impediment to any artificer or merchant stranger of what nation or country he be, or shall be, for bringing into this realm, or selling by retail or otherwise, of any manner books, written or imprinted, or for the inhabiting within the said realm for the same intent, or to any writer, limpner, binder, or imprinter of such books as he hath or shall have to sell by way of merchandise, or for their abode in the same realm for the exercising of the said occupations: this act or any part thereof notwithstanding." The effect of this liberal and enlightened enactment was marvellous; for in the next age a flood of light was spread over the land by the diffusion of knowledge which finally led to the great Reformation.

Manufactures, &c. — The enactment which thus allowed free trade in books is the more remarkable because the commercial acts of the last parliament of this period, which gave its sanction to that enlightened measure, are not marked by any advance beyond the principle of protection. Thus, in consequence of petitions to that parliament from the pinners, cutlers, bladesmiths, goldbeaters, blacksmiths, spurriers, founders, cardmakers, wiremongers, and coppersmiths of London and other cities, towns, boroughs, and villages, an act was passed prohibiting the importation of all articles made by the petitioners. By this list of manufacturers, it will be perceived that the manufacture of metals was now divided into many branches; this division of labour as a natural consequence greatly contributing to their further improvement and their diversity. This is, however, more clearly seen in the list of articles prohibited, namely, harness for girdles, pins, knives, hangers, tailors' shears, scissors, and irons, tongs, fire-forks, gridirons, stock-locks, keys, hinges, garnets, spurs, beaten gold or beaten silver wrought in papers for painters, horse-harness, bits, stirrups, buckles, chains, latten nails with iron shanks, turnels, candlesticks, both standing and hanging, holy water stops, chaffing-dishes, having lavers, curtain rings, cards for wool, clasps for gowns, buckles for shoes, brooches, bells, tin and leaden spoons, wire of latten and iron, grates, and other articles manufactured by the petitioners. This is a sufficient proof that the metallic arts were improved in this period, although it must still be considered they were in their infancy, especially if compared with their present state of perfection, when it would be difficult to require any requisite article which is not already in the market.

The most important branch of England's industry in the fifteenth century was that of the clothiers. It was at length discovered that it would be more profitable to turn wool into cloth at home than to pay foreigners for doing it; and that wool made into cloth was a more valuable article for export than in the fleece. It is true there were no factories, but there were numerous hands engaged in the manufacture of cloth. The manufacture was carried on in all its branches by workmen in their own homes. The carder, the spinster, the weaver, the fuller, and the shearman or dyer, all worked for the tradesman whose

capital was engaged in cloth making, in their own cottage. And they were taken under the special protection of the laws. The dealings of the clothmaker and his workmen were regulated by statute. The truck system was especially forbidden. The workpeople were not to be paid partly in "pins, girdles, and other unprofitable wares;" but were to receive for their labour their full wages in the lawful money of the realm. On the other hand, the clothmaker was equally protected, for he was not to give out wool beyond its proper weight, and every clothworker was to perform his duty in his occupation. During this period, a great number of statutes were made for the improvement of clothing arts; from which statutes it is evident that the woollen manufacture had, long before its close, become the most important branch of industry, producing not only sufficient cloths of various kinds for home consumption, but for exportation. This change, so beneficial to the industrial classes of England and so conducive to its wealth, was not looked upon with a favourable eye by foreign potentates. Thus, partly from political antipathy, but chiefly from jealousy of the prosperity of the woollen manufacture of England, the duke of Burgundy, in the reign of Edward IV., ordained that all woollen cloths should be banished out of his land; and Edward, perceiving that this measure was detrimental to the interests of the weavers, fullers, dyers, carders, spinners, and winders of yarn, adopting the anti-commercial spirit of the duke, prohibited the importation of all merchandizes of all his lands upon pain of forfeiture. But this anti-commercial spirit was universal; all classes of society partaking of it, from the highest to the lowest. They were willing, indeed, to export, but very unwilling to reciprocate. The grand idea of the period was to protect native labour from foreign competition. Thus, during this period, the arts of spinning, throwing, and weaving silk were brought into England, and practised in London by a company of "silk women;" and although they produced no great quantities, a petition was presented by them to parliament, A.D. 1455, representing that the Lombards and other Italians imported such quantities of silk thread, ribands, and laces, that they were in danger of being reduced to poverty, whereupon there was an act passed against their importation, for that it caused "great idleness amongst young gentlewomen and other apprentices of the same crafts, and the laying down of many good and notable households of them that have occupied the same crafts, which be convenient, worshipful, and according for gentlewomen and other women of worship." There was a continual clamour throughout the period for protection, which was readily accorded; and yet, judging from the preambles to most of the protecting acts, men and women of manual occupations were always coming to poverty, and were not able to live "by their mysteries." The grand secret that in free trade lies the wealth of nations had certainly not yet been discovered: a truth which will be well illustrated in the succeeding section on commerce.

SECTION II.

Commerce.—The rule of the House of Lancaster was rather unfavourable to the interests of the national industry. During that rule trade met with many obstructions which retarded its progress and extension. In the first instance, the long and expensive foreign wars in which its earlier kings engaged, were adverse to its growth; and when they were ended, then civil war was fruitful of mischiefs inflicted on commerce. But with all its drawbacks, commerce still continued its onward progress; slowly, but surely, making its way towards that condition of which the poet speaks when he describes it as having "put a girdle round the globe." Had the Plantagenets, however, been men of peace, they might have promoted commerce more than any other race of kings before them, for there was, during their rule, a wider intercourse with other nations than had before been known, and hence, by judicious legislation, the infancy of trade might have grown into adolescence, if not to manhood. Still, although their warlike propensities checked the growth of commerce, they did something towards keeping it in the state in which they found it, and in some instances to advance it a stage towards maturity. At all events Henry IV., in his intervals of rest from war, turned his attention to the promotion and the protection of the commerce of his subjects. In the first year of his reign, for instance, he granted letters of marque and reprisal against the earl of Holland, and issued orders to his admirals to detain all vessels and property in England, belonging to the people of Holland and Zealand, till the said earl should compel his subjects to pay certain debts owing to English creditors, which had become overdue. In that same year, Henry also summoned the governors of the several Hanse-towns, with their protector, the grand master of the Teutonic order of knights, to appear before his council, either in person or by deputy, to answer the complaints of English merchants who had represented that they were not treated so well in those towns as merchants from them were treated in England. There was a treaty in existence which fully secured the mutual protection of the merchants of England and of the Hanse-towns, which both appear to have infringed, for each complained of the other before the council, and gave in high estimates of the damages they had sustained; and, in the end, the dispute was settled by Henry paying 15,595 gold nobles to the grand master, and 416 to the magistrates of Hamburgh; while the grand master, on the other hand, paid only 766 to the English sufferers. It may be concluded from this that the mischiefs inflicted on the Hanse-town merchants by the English preponderated. Among other claims these merchants demanded damages for several hundreds of their countrymen, who had been thrown overboard and drowned by the English—to which claim Henry answered that when he was made acquainted with the number, state, and condition of those who had thus lost their lives, he would cause suffrages and prayers and other wholesome remedies, profitable for their souls and acceptable to God and men, to be ordained and provided, upon condition that they would provide the like remedy for the souls of the English who had been

drowned by the people of the Hanse-towns. This peculiar claim was never satisfied; but to prevent the recurrence of such outrages, a new treaty was concluded on the basis of mutual freedom of trade and oblivion of past injuries. Treaties on the same basis of reciprocity of trade were made by Henry IV. with Portugal, Flanders, Brittany, Castile, and other countries; and the growing importance of foreign trade at this time is further indicated by the public recognition given to associated bodies of merchants who were allowed to elect governors whose functions somewhat resembled those of modern consuls, and who usually resided in the foreign country to which those who elected them traded. But with all this seeming liberty of commerce, it was fettered and shackled by restrictions. Neither the merchants nor the legislators of this period entertained any just ideas of the best means of promoting its extension. The British merchant, as a rule, was a monopolizer. Foreigners were universally considered interlopers and enemies—men who came into England for the sole purpose of enriching themselves at the expense of the native merchants. Hence, while Henry, on the one hand, entered into treaties for freedom of commerce, on the other hand, at the instigation of native merchants, restrictions were laid upon it which went far to nullify the effect of those treaties. Thus, in the 4th and 5th of this reign, it was enacted that all foreign merchants should expend all the money they received for the goods they imported in English merchandize to be exported; that they should not carry any gold or silver out of the country either in coin, plate, or bullion, under the pain of forfeiture; that all the goods they imported should be sold within the space of three months; that one merchant-stranger should not sell any goods to another merchant-stranger; and that when any foreign merchant should arrive in any port or town in England, he was to lodge with a host assigned to him, and with no one else while he remained in the country. These restrictions exhibit great jealousy towards foreign merchants, and they could not fail greatly to interfere with the freedom of commerce.

But, notwithstanding foreign merchants were thus exposed to jealousies, insults, and hardships, those companies which had been incorporated by royal charters in previous periods still existed in London and other places. And that they flourished in the midst of all they had to endure is evident; for it is on record that the merchants of the staple, in the year 1458, paid, for customs on wool, woolfels, woollen cloth, leather, tin, and lead, which they exported, no less a sum than 68,000*l.*, containing as much silver as 136,000*l.* present money. This company, however, flourishing as it was at this date, was finally ruined by competition. In the thirteenth century a company of English merchants, called the brotherhood of St. Thomas à-Becket, was established, and from that time had been working its way in the commercial world by the exportation of woollen cloth. As the manufacture of that article increased, the trade of this brotherhood also increased. At the commencement of the fifteenth century it had become a society of so much importance that, in the year 1406, Henry IV. incorporated it by a charter regulating their government and their privileges. After their incorporation, the brotherhood became a formidable rival to the merchants of the staple; for being composed of native subjects, English and Irish, it was favoured both by government and the people, so that ultimately it monopolized the chief trade in woollen cloth, and the merchants of the staple were fairly driven out of the field of English commerce.

It has been seen that in the last period all export or import of merchandize in any other ships than those of English bottoms was strictly prohibited. This law, however, was probably not very strictly enforced; for in the documents relating to the quarrel with the Hanse-towns, foreign ships are expressly mentioned as being laden with goods belonging to English merchants. At the commencement of this century, A.D. 1409, express permission was granted by Henry IV. to the merchants of Venice to bring merchandize into England and other ports of his dominions in their own vessels; and when they had sold them, to load them with English goods, and to return to their own country without let or hindrance. This permission was renewed by Henry V., who, also, at the commencement of his reign, confirmed the privileges that had been granted by his father and his predecessors to foreign merchants. But the reign of Henry V. was a blank in commercial enterprise. The warlike spirit which was engendered by his attempted conquest of France rendered the people, as a nation, averse to every peaceful pursuit. Every branch of social industry languished during this dream of glory in the blood-stained fields of France. Commerce did not suffer more, if so much, by the misgovernment of Henry VI., and the civil wars with which his reign was marked, than by the victories of his father in those fields of glory. Even the loss of France, although the English people considered it to be a calamity and a disgrace, and for which Henry VI. suffered in the loss of popular favour, was rather a gain than a loss to the nation as regards commerce. It is true that during the last years of the reign of the unfortunate Henry VI., when the kingdom was almost left without a government, and the country was one great battle-field, in which the Yorkists and and Lancastrians contended for the victory with deadly energy, foreign commerce greatly suffered; but no sooner was peace restored by the triumph of the House of York than it began to revive. Commerce had now taken such deep root that it could not receive a lasting injury—it might droop and languish under foreign and civil war, but peace was its infallible restorer to life and vigour. Edward IV. paid great attention to mercantile affairs, not only protecting and encouraging the trade of his subjects, but engaging in trade himself whereby he obtained considerable wealth. His reign is marked by many commercial treaties with foreign powers, viz., Denmark, Brittany, Castile, the Netherlands, the Hanse-towns, now comprising nearly seventy in number, Spain, and other countries. Although by the treaty of Henry IV. with the authorities of the Hanse-towns, past injuries were to be buried in oblivion, during the whole of this period they appear to have been remembered and revenged. This treaty, indeed, like others, was only made to be broken. Rather the privileges which had been granted to the

Hanse merchants were only, as a rule, granted for short terms, but the treaty which was now made went to establish the Hanse factories upon a permanent foundation. All complaints were to cease for ever, all past injuries were to be buried in the grave of oblivion, the Hanse merchants were to receive 10,000*l.* in full of all demands, and judges were to be be appointed on both sides to do justice without any legal formalities between the parties, whether in civil or criminal causes. It is clear that during the reign of Edward IV. there was a great impetus given to foreign commerce. Awakening from their dream of glory, the people eagerly engaged in it. It became as popular as war had been, and infinitely more profitable. War emptied the public and private purses, commerce filled them to the overflow. To Edward IV. commerce was a perfect Pactolus; for, besides the gains which he derived from it by his own commercial transactions, he obtained, during his reign, loans to a large amount from individual merchants and from mercantile communities, both of his own kingdom and of other countries. That trade and commerce at the close of this period were considered of the highest importance to the welfare of the community, is clear from the fact that out of the fifteen acts passed by the *one* parliament of Richard III., seven of them related solely to commerce and manufactures. But few of the acts of parliament of this period, from its commencement to its close, were really calculated to extend commerce; or if they were, their effects were in a great measure neutralized by unenlightened and arbitrary restrictions.

Notwithstanding, individuals by the pursuit of trade sometimes rose, not only to wealth, but even to rank and power. Thus, William de la Pole, a merchant, who flourished in the reign of Edward III., was made chief baron of the exchequer, and a knight banneret, and his descendants became earls, marquises, and dukes of Suffolk; the second duke, John de la Pole, even marrying princess Elizabeth, sister of Edward IV. At the death of his son, the prince of Wales, Richard III. declared the eldest son of John de la Pole and Elizabeth presumptive heir to the throne, and at the same time a marriage was arranged between their daughter Ann and James, duke of Rothsay, afterwards James IV. of Scotland. But having reached this giddy height, the family of the De la Poles sank faster than they had risen; their alliance with the House of York and the prospect of their succession to the crown proving, in the reign of Henry VII., the cause of their ruin. But one of the greatest merchants of this period flourished in the reign of Henry VI. This was William Canyng, who was five times mayor of Bristol, and a great benefactor to that city: the magnificent church of St. Mary Redcliffe being founded by him. On his monument in that church it is recorded that Edward IV. on one occasion seized 2470 tons of shipping belonging to him, in which were included three vessels of great size for that period, one of 400, a second of 500, and a third of 900 tons. It is not stated why Edward seized Canyng's shipping, but it may be supposed that it was because he steadily adhered to the Lancastrian cause, for Henry VI. had bestowed great favours on the Bristol merchant. Thus, in the year 1450, Henry granted him permission to employ two ships of whatever burden in trade to Iceland and Finmark for two years; and in the preceding year he addressed two letters to the grand master of Prussia and the magistrates of Dantzic, entreating their favour for two factors, resident within the jurisdiction of his "beloved and honourable merchant, William Canyng." Another of the merchant princes of this period was Richard Whytington, "thrice lord mayor of London," who flourished in the reign of Henry IV., to whom he lent on one occasion the large sum for those days of 1,000*l.* on the security of the subsidies on wool hides and woolfels. The story of Whytington and his cat is too well known to be recorded in our pages, especially as it is mere fable, for its hero was not a scullion-boy, as it

SHIPS OF THE 15TH CENTURY.

represents, but the son of Sir William Whytington, a knight. Other London merchants who lent Henry IV. money were John Norbury and John Hende, who appear at that time to have been even more wealthy than Whytington, for their respective loans were double the amount of his. All these three merchants were great benefactors to the good city of London; for while Whytington erected an almshouse near Highgate, which still remains a monument of his wealth and munificence, Norbury and Hende founded several churches, colleges, and charitable institutions. At Hull also there flourished a merchant prince in this period, one John Taverner, who built a ship as large as a great Venetian carrick, for which Henry VI. in the year 1449 granted him a license to carry wool, tin, lambskins, passelarges, and other hides, from the ports of London, Southampton, Hull, or Sandwich, on simply paying alien's duty to Italy, and to bring back with him bow staves, wax, and other foreign produce to England. As Macpherson observes, this exemption of an English subject from the law of the staple, in consideration of the extraordinary size of his vessel, is a proof that no such vessel had hitherto been built in this country.

One of the chief means by which commerce was promoted in this period was the jealous care with which the narrow seas between our island and the continent was guarded. The importance and necessity of being masters at sea was generally acknowledged both by the Plantagenet kings and their subjects. A rhyming pamphlet, written about the year 1433, earnestly inculcated this policy, asserting that if the English kept the seas they would compel all the world to be at peace with them, and to court their friendship. It was for the purpose of guarding the seas and protecting commerce, that the ancient duty of tonnage and poundage was granted to our kings by parliament. In the year 1406, Henry IV. tried an experiment of imposing this task on the merchants themselves, granting them, with the consent of parliament, a duty of three shillings on every ton of wine, five per cent. on all other goods imported, and the fourth part of the subsidy on wool and leather for that purpose. But this experiment was a failure. It was soon discovered that the merchants took no care to guard the seas, and Henry therefore stopped the payment of the duties granted to them, and took the matter in his own hands. He maintained the dominion of the seas with great spirit. While engaged, indeed, against the earl of Northumberland, the confederates, the French, Flemings, and Bretons, insulted the English coasts, and interrupted the English commerce; but an ample revenge was taken upon them for their depredations. But it was in the reign of Henry V. that the dominion of the seas was more fully secured. By two successive victories the united fleets of France and Genoa were almost annihilated, and the fleets of England rode triumphant over the narrow seas. To contend with the French and Genoese, Henry built some dromios or large ships of war at Southampton, three of which, according to the author of the rhyming pamphlet above mentioned, were called the 'Trinity,' the 'Grace de Dieu,' and the 'Holy Ghost.' Another writer of the period mentions two ships belonging to the fleet with which Henry made his second invasion of France under the names of the 'King's Chamber' and the 'King's Hall,' the former in which the king himself sailed, carrying a sail of purple silk, whereon was embroidered the arms of England and France. During the long and turbulent reign of Henry VI., the affairs of England, both by land and sea, declined: the French not only expelling the English from their own country except Calais, but insulting and plundering their own coasts. The great earl of Warwick, however, on being appointed admiral, scoured the channel, and captured several French ships, by which the dominion of the seas was in some degree recovered. But it was more fully restored in the reign of Edward IV., who not only protected the trade of his subjects by his fleets, but was enabled to employ some of his own ships in trade, as a merchant, no foreign power daring to molest them. In the brief reign of Richard III., no particular attention seems to have been paid to the dominion of the sea; otherwise with the numerous ships which Edward IV. had collected before his death to invade France, he might have prevented the landing of his successful rival, Henry, earl of Richmond. Beyond the precaution of having beacons on the hills of the coast, which were lamps fastened upon beams of timber, nothing was done even to obtain information of the movements of the enemy while crossing the channel.

During this period the English merchants enlarged their borders, visiting some seas and coasts unfrequented in the fourteenth century. Thus, in the year 1413, a company of London merchants loaded several ships with cargoes of merchandize to the value of 24,000*l.* for the western parts of Morocco, which appears to have been the first adventure of the English to those parts. But this adventure proved unfortunate, for the Genoese seized these ships and their cargoes, being jealous of their own trade with that country, for which outrage Henry granted their owners letters of marque to seize the ships and goods of the Genoese wherever they could find them. Trade had long existed between Venice, Genoa, Florence, and other cities of Italy and England, but it appears to have been carried on in foreign bottoms and by foreign merchants. This trade at one time seems to have been more favourable to the Italian communities than England, for the rhyming author of the 'Libel of English Policy,' says that these foreign merchants bore the gold out of this land, and sucked the thrift out of the hands of English merchants, "as the wasp sucketh honey out of the bee." Various attempts were made by English merchants in the course of this period to obtain a share in this trade, but it was not till the reign of Richard III. that they obtained any solid footing in Italy. Hitherto their design had not only been opposed by the Italian merchants themselves, but by the English kings who favoured them, because they were ever ready to accommodate them with loans in their necessities, and also because they paid higher customs than their own subjects: self-interest in this instance, therefore, retarding the progress of English commerce.

The exports of this period were more numerous than those of the fourteenth century. But there was one which no longer existed—the bones and sinews of

man. Slaves no longer formed an item of the export trade. But, according to some authors, another item of a singular character took its place—that of pilgrims. Ship-loads of these were ever and anon carried from England to the continent, to pay their devotions at the shrines of imaginary saints. Permits were continually granted by the monarchs of this period to carry pilgrims from such a port to the shrine of such a saint, expressly named in the permit. Thus, in the year 1434, Henry IV. granted permits for the exportation of 2433 devotees to the shrine of St. James of Compostella. But in this singular article there was full and complete reciprocity between England and the continent, in which England had the advantage, for there was a greater importation of pilgrims from the continent to visit the renowned shrine of St. Thomas-à-Becket, at Canterbury, than were exported to all the shrines on the continent put together. It is certain that this was a profitable trade—for trade it was—as the people everywhere were taught that the saints loved money, and rich were the offerings laid at the feet of their altars.

The staple articles of exportation were wool, woollen cloths, and, when permitted, corn. But there were a miscellaneous variety of other articles exported, many of which were permitted, at times, for particular persons to be exported without paying customs. Thus, in the 'Fœdera' occurs this list of articles, which, in the year 1428, were shipped duty free for the king of Portugal, and the countess of Holland. For the king, 6 silver cups, gilded, each of the weight of 6 marks, or 4 pounds; 1 piece of scarlet cloth; 1 piece of sanguine, dyed in grain; 1 piece of blood-colour; 2 pieces of mustrevilus; 2 pieces of marble colour; 2 pieces of russet mustrevilus; 2 pieces of black cloth of lyre; 1 piece of white woollen cloth; 300 pieces of Essex straits, for liveries; 2000 platters, dishes, saucers, pots, and other vessels of electrum; a number of beds of various kinds and sizes, with curtains; 60 rolls of worsted; 12 dozen of lances, and 26 ambling horses. For the countess there were quantities of various woollen cloths; 12 yards of red figured satin; 2 pieces of white kersey; 3 mantles of rabbits' fur; 1½ timber of martins' fur; and a quantity of rye, both whole and ground. If all these articles were not produced in England, they certainly could be purchased, and formed a part of the export trade. Another article of export, and one of no mean consequence, was Yarmouth herrings. That trade had commenced in the preceding century, but it was now considerably enlarged, for the consumption of herrings was great in all the nations of Europe, and there were none so good as those of Yarmouth. The English herring fishery was carried on with vigour and success. And connected with this trade the singular fact occurs that one of the clergy was a great dealer in red herrings. Matthew Paris says that William Trumpington, in the reign of Henry III., had agents at Yarmouth at the proper season, who purchased large quantities of herrings, which he stored up in a house which he had bought for fifty marks, till they were sold "to the inestimable advantage as well as honour of his abbey." But it was not only in red herrings that the clergy traded, for frequent mention is made of bishops and other ecclesiastics of rank having vessels for the exportation of wool and other goods. Licences were even granted them by the English kings to export without paying custom duties, and it is said that, notwithstanding they were thus favoured, they sometimes carried on a little smuggling.

The 'Libel of English Policy' gives a distinct account of articles imported into England by the merchants of different countries, or carried by them to the great emporium of Bruges, in Flanders, and from thence imported by English merchants. Bruges was at this period the great emporium of Europe, to which the merchants, both of the south and the north, conveyed their goods for sale. So great was their resort to it that, in the year 1486, one hundred and fifty ships, laden with merchandize, arrived at its harbour of Sluys in one day. Thither, from Spain, were brought figs, raisins, wines, oils, soap, dates, liquorice, wax, iron, wool, wadmote, skins of goats and kids, saffron, and quicksilver; from Portugal, wine, wax, grain, figs, raisins, honey, cordovan, dates, salt, and hides; from Brittany, wine, salt, linen, and canvas; from Germany and Prussia, corn, iron, steel, copper, bowstaves, boards, wax, pitch, tar, flax, hemp, peltrey, thread, fustian, buckram, canvas, and woolcards; from Genoa, gold, cloth of gold, silk, cotton, oil, black pepper, roek alum, and woad; and from Venice, Florence, and other Italian states, spices, groceries, sweet wines, sugar, drugs, and

> "Apes, and japes, and marmusits tayled
> And niflis and triplis that little have avayled."

Such appear to have been the chief imports of England in the fifteenth century, and many of its articles were brought thither in considerable quantities. It is related that Henry VI., in 1450, made a purchase of alum from some merchants of Genoa, who brought it to English ports to the amount of 4000*l.*, and that he resold it for twice that amount. But it would appear that Henry did not pay ready money for his alum. On the contrary, their claim was to be settled by the remission of customs' duties upon the goods brought and carried away with them on this and on future occasions, till the debt should be paid: parliament granting them a licence in the meantime to export any staple wares whatever from the south part of England. Henry resold his alum to English merchants for ready money, and parliament granted them a monopoly of the whole trade for the next two years; so that we may conclude that what with the king's profit of 4000*l.*, and the additional price put upon it by the English merchants, the consumers of alum were pretty well fleeced between them. Another article imported into England at this time was stock fish, which was procured from Iceland by some merchants of Bristol and other towns, chiefly for the purpose of victualling ships for long voyages. But this appears to have been a very uncertain trade, for the Danish government made repeated attempts to prevent the English from trading to the coasts of Iceland, so that at times the vessels sent out could not obtain full freights.

Concerning the balance of trade in the fifteenth century very little is known. From the amount of trade carried on, however, there is reason to believe

that it was in favour of England, and that it was very valuable. The author of the 'Libel of English Policy,' as before mentioned, intimates that the balance of trade with Venice and Florence was when he wrote in favour of the Italian communities; but if it was then, it was clearly not always so, for the money payments made to England during some years amounted annually to 100,000 ducats, and it is expressly stated that during these years the balance was against the republic. That, on the whole, the balance of trade was greatly in favour of England is evident from the great increase which took place in some articles of export, especially in the most important of all, woollen cloth. It is evident also, from the fact that the kings of this period expended immense riches in their wars, which could not have been sustained if the profits on manufactures and merchandize had not been very considerable. But, perhaps, the strongest proof of trade being profitable may be found in the great increase of the wealth of individual merchants, instances of which have been given; and the flourishing condition of most of the commercial cities and towns, and especially of London. Then, again, there was still large sums of money sent from England to the court of Rome, which could never have taken place had not trade been profitable, for we hear of no gold or silver mines being worked during this period. While, therefore, English money found its way to the continent—for it was current in every part of Europe—foreign money must have flowed into England, otherwise the country would soon have been in a state of bankruptcy. It was trade alone that sustained the public credit, and it may safely be concluded, in the absence of all correct data, that the balance of trade, notwithstanding the many hindrances to its extension, was, as in former periods, in favour of England. In a word, despite all the vicious legislation of the monarchs and parliaments of this period, it is clear, from a review of the whole, that commerce made considerable advances, and that, therefore, it was profitable to the community.

The same may also be said of the commerce of Scotland, although, compared with that of England, it was very limited. Even at the commencement of the century, when that country was rent with faction, there is evidence that it was not wholly neglected. It is recorded that in the year 1410, Sir Robert Umfreville, an English admiral, sailed up the Frith of Forth and captured fourteen "good ships," which were laden with woollen and linen cloth, pitch, tar, meal, wheat, and rye; besides burning several others, one of which, for its size, was called the "Grand galliot of Scotland." Umfreville also plundered the surrounding coasts of that sea, and on his return, it is said that he brought home so much corn that the English market was cheapened, for which he obtained the expressive name of Robert Mendmarket. It is probable, however, that the ships captured and burnt by the English admiral were not all belonging to Scotland, for at this time the Lombards carried on a considerable trade with that country, and, therefore, some of these ships might have belonged to Lombard merchants. On the restoration of James I. to his throne, by various legislative acts he sought to improve the commerce of his country. Thus, by several of his acts, he procured an uniformity of weights and measures throughout his kingdom: which acts defined also what were to be sold by weight and what by measure. These acts were passed in the year 1425, and in the same year it was ordained that merchants returning from foreign countries should always bring back with them harness, or defensive armour, spears, shafts, bows, and staves. In order to encourage commerce a law was subsequently passed permitting merchants for one whole year to ship their goods in foreign vessels if no Scottish vessels could be found, which implies that commerce was at this date, A.D. 1428, fettered in Scotland for want of shipping, and not for lack of goods or enterprise. That James desired to make trade lucrative to his kingdom is evident, from the laws passed to increase its stock of gold and silver; for by these laws all merchants were compelled to bring home a certain quantity of bullion in proportion to the value of goods they exported; a duty of ten per cent. was laid on gold and silver coins exported; and, finally, the exportation of the precious metals, coined or uncoined, was prohibited. Other laws were also passed for the same purpose, as those for ascertaining the rate of customs on all exports and imports, and for securing the effects of traders who died in foreign lands. It is probable James had the same end in view in a law passed A.D. 1430, which ordained that no person under the rank of a knight, or who had not an income of 200 marks and upwards, should wear cloths made of silk or adorned with the finest furs, for to obtain these expensive articles his subjects must have spent some of their gold and silver. Or it may be that this law was passed to preserve distinction of rank; for it is clear from such an enactment that some of the less wealthy classes indulged themselves in these expensive kinds of dress. It does not appear, however, that the enactments of James improved the trade of the country to any great extent. About the date of his death, the rhyming author of 'The Libel of English Policy' says that the exports of Scotland were only three in number: namely, wool, woolfells, and hides. At this time the chief continental trade of the Scottish merchants was carried on at Bruges; from whence, in addition to the bullion which they obtained for their raw materials, they brought home foreign manufactures of various kinds, among which are expressly mentioned, mercery, haberdashery, cart-wheels, and barrows. The reign of James II. was not marked by any legislative enactments greatly advantageous to commerce. He renewed the laws that had been made by his father for the uniformity of weights and measures, and for regulating fairs and markets; but beyond this, the mercantile regulations of this prince chiefly related to the coinage. That merchants in his reign were men of some importance is evident, as some of them were employed by him in embassies and other public business in connection with the barons and the clergy. Indeed, unless a person was of good credit, and had a certain amount of property, by a law passed in 1458, he was not allowed to go abroad as a merchant. At the same time some merchants were held in higher esteem than others; for if they were aldermen, bailies, or in some way connected with a town council, they might wear silk, scarlet, or fur of martens, but not

otherwise. In the reign of James III. several commercial laws were enacted, but they are not marked by any great depth of wisdom or knowledge of the subject in the legislators of Scotland. The attempt to promote the importation of bullion, and to prevent the exportation of coin, was carried on with greater vigour than ever; but despite all enactments to that end, money was still as scarce as ever. Nor could it be otherwise, for the value of goods imported exceeded in amount that of the exports, and hence the balance had to be paid in money. While, therefore, the merchants brought home and delivered to the master of the mint the stipulated quantity of bullion for every sack of wool, last of hides, or measure of other goods exported, it is clear they were under the necessity of paying coin away to a large amount for the manufactured goods which they imported. It was vain to expect that under such circumstances the wealth of the country could have been increased, especially as commerce was surrounded by other restrictions fatal to its interest. Thus, in the year 1467, it was ordained that no person should trade as a merchant unless he was a free burgess resident within burgh, and not even then unless he was "a famous and worshipful man," having half a last of goods or more in property or trust. No handicraftsman or artisan was

ARTISANS.

allowed to engage in trade at all, except he renounced his craft and obtained a special licence for that purpose. It is difficult to conceive the purport of such a law except it was to preserve the monopoly of the foreign trade in the hands of the richer merchants. By another law, no vessel was allowed to sail to any foreign country between the end of October and the beginning of February, which must have been very detrimental to the interests of commerce, although it was ostensibly passed for its protection, or rather the preservation of the shipping, sailing at that season being deemed peculiarly dangerous. From another act of the same parliament, it would appear that the nobility and prelates were allowed to export the produce of their own lands, and import goods necessary for their households. Indeed, throughout the whole of this period they enjoyed the same privilege, and in some instances they even openly, like the nobles and prelates of England, pursued trade as a source of profit. It is on record that the earl of Douglas, the duke of Albany, and bishops Wardlaw and Kennedy, were the proprietors of vessels which they freighted with merchandize for their own gain.

Although the author of 'The Libel of English Policy' mentions only three articles of export in his time, it must not be supposed that no others were exported during this period. As far as can be gathered, the chief articles were wool, woolfells, woollen cloth, leather, salted hides, skins of harts, does, roes, conies, and others, black cattle, horses, and sheep, and herrings, and salmon. Great attention was paid by the Scots to the fisheries on their coasts and in their rivers during this period. A high value was set on salmon, for it was ordained that none should be sold to the English but for the immediate payment in gold and silver; or to the French but for gold, silver, or claret wine. The articles of import consisted of silks and fine cloths, wines, groceries, hardware, armour and arms, furniture, implements of husbandry, and corn. This last was one of the chief articles of importation, thus proving that agriculture had not yet made any great advance in Scotland.

Concerning the trade of Ireland, very little is known during this century; but according to 'The Libel of English Policy,' its exports were hides, wool, salmon, hake, herrings, linen, falding or coarse cloth, and the skins of harts, otters, martens, squirrels, hares, rabbits, sheep, foxes, and kids. No mention is made of its imports; and from the rude state of the country, it can scarcely be supposed that either they or the exports were of any great value. The Irish, indeed, appear to have been far behind the Scots in commercial enterprise, for we read of no great merchants as belonging to that country.

The coinage of this period was the same as regards the denominations as in the preceding age. But although the names and relative values of both gold and silver coins remained the same, their positive values became less and less by degrees. Edward III. had set an example of diminishing the value of the coinage. It has been seen that from the time of the conquest to his reign, 240 pennies were coined out of a Tower pound of silver weighing 5400 grains troy: that is, 22½ grains troy each. Edward, however, coined 270 pennies out of the Tower pound, thus reducing their weight to 20 grains troy each; the effect of which was to lower the value of the nominal pound from about 56*s.* 3*d.* of our present money to somewhat less than 50*s.* By another change in the coinage Edward depreciated it still more, for he coined groats weighing only 72 grains which ought to have weighed 90 according to the original scale, or 80 according to his reduced rate, by which the value of the nominal pound was reduced to about 46*s.* of present money. It was in this state that Henry IV. found the coinage of the realm. It remained in that state till the year 1412, when it was directed "That by reason of the great scarcity of money in the realm of England, the pound tower should, from the feast of Easter following, be coined into thirty shillings by tale; that is, into 360 pennies. By this change the amount of silver in each penny was reduced to 15 grains troy in weight, and from 3*d.* to not quite 2*d.* in value. This

brought down the value of the nominal pound from 46*s.* to 37*s.* 9*d.* of our present money. The reason given for such a reduction—that money was scarce—was an absurdity, for by no process of cutting a thing in two, whether of money or anything else of intrinsic value, can it be made more plentiful. Those who devised this expedient seems to have had their doubts of its wisdom or success, for it was ordained that it should be tried for two years, and that if at the end of that time it should be found against the profit of the king and his realm, it should then cease. It was found against the profit of the realm, but the base coinage was profitable to Henry, and, therefore, he still continued to coin upon that footing. And it was not only the silver coinage that he depreciated. The first gold nobles struck by Henry weighed 120 grains, which was of the same weight as those of his predecessor, Richard II.; but in the last year of his reign he reduced the noble to 108 grains, thus diminishing its intrinsic value one-tenth. During the reigns of Henry V. and VI. the values of the several denominations remained the same—the only difference in the coinage being in the images and superscriptions stamped thereon. During his dream of conquest, Henry V. struck various coins of gold, and groats, half-groats, quarter-groats, mancois, and petit deniers of silver; and after the treaty of Troyes, he coined others, called saluts, demi-saluts, blancs, &c., on which was inscribed *Hæres Francæ*, or Heir of France. His

NOBLE OF HENRY V.

HALF NOBLE OF HENRY V.

ANGEL OF EDWARD IV.

example was also followed by Henry VI., who, in the early part of his reign, deeming himself king of France, coined saluts, angelots, franks, and nobles of gold; and groats, blancs, and petit deniers in silver. But the wars with France had the effect of making money still more scarce than it had been in the time of Henry IV., and in order to make it more plentiful, Edward IV. adopted the vicious system of reducing its value: in other words, of robbing the public to replenish his exchequer. In the year 1464, Edward ordered the tower pound of silver to be coined into 37*s.* 6*d.* by tale, or into 450 pennies, thus reducing the nominal pound to about 30*s.* of present money. Edward IV. also struck gold coins of depreciated value. These were called angels and angelots, or half angels; and they were so named from having the figure of an angel on the reverse. They were intended to represent the noble and half noble; and were ordered to pass for the same value, namely, 6*s.* 8*d.* and 3*s.* 4*d.* respectively. But their intrinsic value was far inferior. As before seen, the noble of the fourteenth century weighed 120 grains, which Henry IV. reduced eventually to 108 grains. The angel of Edward IV., however, weighed only 80 grains, and was, therefore, worth but little more than three-fourths of Henry's depreciated noble, and only two-thirds of the original coin of that name: in plainer terms, while the noble of the fourteenth century was of the value of 21*s.* 1½*d.*, Edward's representative of that coin, called the angel, was worth only 14*s.* 1*d.* of present money. As may be supposed, these changes in the currency were productive of both inconvenience and loss to the people, and the occasion of great confusion in all mercantile and money transactions. Even to the crown, the benefit was only temporary; but it was long before its evil tendency was discovered, for in the next age it will be seen, and especially in the reign of Henry VIII., the coinage became still more and more debased.

SEAL OF EDWARD IV.

In Scotland the depreciation of the coin was more remarkable than in England. On his return to his kingdom in 1424, James I. found that the real value

of the Scottish money was far below that of England, and that the difference between the coins of the two kingdoms was a great interruption to trade and commerce. This was one of the many evils he sought to remedy. James obtained an act of parliament which empowered him to "mend his money;" that is, to restore it to the same weight and fineness with that which then existed in England. But it was impossible to obtain this uniformity. On the contrary, from the disorders of the kingdom the coinage of Scotland became more and more deteriorated, till at length, towards the end of the period, the Scottish coins were scarcely more than one-fourth of the weight and value of those of England; the pound of silver, which had been originally coined into 20 shillings, being, in the year 1475, coined into 144. Nor had it yet reached its lowest point, for, as in England, during the next age the shilling, which was then worth but little more than 4½*d.* of our present money, becoming smaller by degrees and "beautifully less," until at length, in 1601, it was not worth, in weight and value, a single penny present money; no less than 720*s.* being coined out of the pound tower or 5400 grains troy. It may be stated, however, that the gold coins of both kingdoms were of the same weight and fineness throughout the whole of this period, which would indicate that the precious metal was more abundant than that of silver; or, at all events, that it was not deemed politic to adopt the nefarious and mischievous process of reducing its value, as in the case of silver.

In connection with the subject of trade and commerce, it may be mentioned that public posts were, at the close of this period, first established, for the conveyance of intelligence both in England and France. Letters were forwarded by them at the rate of a hundred miles a day, by means of post-horses changed every twenty miles. These posts, however, were not established for the benefit of the public generally, as the postal system is at the present day, but were reserved for the exclusive use of the government. The fact is interesting as the beginning of that widely extended intercourse between man and man which now exists by means of that most important of all the government establishments—the Post Office.

CHAPTER VI.

History of Manners and Customs, &c., from A.D. 1399 to A.D. 1485.

ALTHOUGH, as in former periods, when the Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans successively became dominant in our island, there was no great and striking revolution in the manners and customs of its people; still, during the fifteenth century, there were some remarkable changes which, in a comprehensive history, require delineation. The progress of civilization might be slow at this period; but it was, nevertheless, in a marked state of advancement, despite the public distractions and calamities by which it is darkened. As seen in the previous chapter, there was an extended intercourse with foreign nations; a circumstance which could not fail to introduce improvements of various kinds in all the accommodations of domestic life. The war with France, fatal as it was to the population of England, was not unproductive of good in this respect; for despotic as its government was, the French were, as a nation, more refined than the English, and the warriors who survived that war would necessarily bring home with them, in their own persons, copies of that refinement which they carried into the bosoms of their families. From time to time, also, certain spoils of war were brought back with them into England, which had the effect of extending and improving articles of domestic use which was of no mean advantage to the nation. But the improvements of this period were, perhaps, more native than foreign, for there was a growing intelligence among the people; and intelligence is the fruitful parent of invention, as invention is "the mother of arts."

Chivalry.—Chivalry, which had reached its height in the fourteenth century, rapidly declined in the fifteenth. Real combats took the place of tilts and tournaments. Henry IV. and his gallant sons were too much engaged in the realities of war to follow its shadow. Various other causes led to this change. Battles at this time could not be decided by the headlong charges of lances. Improvements had been made in the art of war, and gunpowder, especially, had taught the brave knights of the period that there was no security in their heavy panoply. Besides, the wars in France had thinned the ranks of the knights, many of them being laid low in its bloody fields. The wars of the Roses, also, had the same effect, for by them many a brave knight perished in the indiscriminate massacres that generally followed a victory. Moreover, it is probable that new tastes and the growing refinement of the period had something to do with the decline of chivalry. We say *decline*, for its spirit was not wholly extinct. Tournaments were still occasionally held; especially at coronations and royal marriages. But these tournaments were shorn of their ancient splendour. Minstrels and heralds were wanting in them, and the young nobles, knights, and gentlemen who displayed their courage, strength, and dexterity in these feats of arms fought only with headless lances and blunted swords and axes. So much had chivalry declined towards the end of this period, that Caxton pours forth a bitter lament over it. He seemed even to question whether many knights could be found who knew their horses and their horses

them—"the more pity is." He would, he added, that it would please "our sovereign lord that twice or thrice a year, or one at least," he would call his knights together "to tournay one against one or two against two," the best to receive a prize, "either a diamond or jewel, as should please him." But the spirit of chivalry could not be called to life again. Edward IV., after he had won his way to the throne, perhaps acting upon Caxton's pathetic lament, endeavoured to recal the tilts and tournaments; but his influence and example was very little heeded. The ghost of chivalry was laid, and could not be resuscitated even by the knightly and princely head of the house of York.

Still Edward did what he could to give vitality to its dry bones. One at least distinguished, if not formidable, combat took place in his reign. That was performed by the bastard of Burgundy and Anthony, Lord Scales, brother to Edward's queen. Great preparations were made for this tournament, which was held at Smithfield in 1467. Philip, duke of Burgundy, the most magnificent prince of that age, arrayed his son for the occasion most gorgeously. He came to England with a thousand Burgundians in his train, to perform feats of arms with his dearly beloved cousin, Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales. Nor was King Edward slow to do him honour. Magnificent lists were erected, which had galleries erected all round for the accommodation both of royalty itself and the general nobility. On the day when this notable tournament commenced, Smithfield was as gay as ever Westminster was; at least, in those days. Besides the king and the queen, there were lords, knights, and ladies of England, France, Scotland, and other countries, all assembled in the gorgeous costumes of the period to witness the scene. A whole year had been spent in settling forms and preliminaries, and all Europe was on tiptoe of expectation about this notable event. Had a kingdom depended upon the issue, there could not have been greater interest felt in the matter. At length the combatants met. The first day no harm was done. The combatants ran at each other with sharpened spears, but no advantage was gained by either. Stow says they departed with equal honour. Again the combatants met, and this time their feats of arms were not so harmless, for the steel spike on the chaffron of Lord Scales' horse ran into the nostrils of the bastard of Burgundy's steed, which, being maddened with the pain, reared and plunged, and fell with its rider prone to the ground. The Lord Scales rode about the fallen hero as though he had been the victor, but the bastard protested against this accidental fall being reckoned as a defeat, and craved another trial. Enough mischief, however, was done on that day, and the final trial was put off till the morrow. On that day the combatants met on foot armed with pole-axes. Stow says they fought valiantly. For some time the issue appears to have been doubtful; and, after all, there was neither victory nor defeat. Lord Scales at last managed to thrust the point of his pole-axe into the sight-hole of his adversary's helmet, "and by fine force might have plucked him on his knees;" but the king cast down his warder, and the marshal severed them. The combat was not renewed, for though the Burgundian desired of the king permission to enter the lists again, when he found that he must, by the law of arms, be replaced in his former position—that is, with the point of his adversary's pole-axe thrust into the "sight-hole" of his helmet—he dropped the matter. At a later date a practice was introduced of separating the combatants by double barriers consisting of boarded partitions from four to five feet in height, open at both ends, and extending nearly the whole length of the lists. By this practice collision between the horses were avoided, and the combatant could only be unhorsed by his adversary's lance. A tournament in this new fashion appears to have been held in 1478, on the occasion of the marriage of Richard, duke of York, with a daughter of the duke of Norfolk; but, compared with the tournaments of the preceding age, it was but an idle parade. The most fatal combats of this kind were judicial encounters, which were intended to decide the truth of charges of treason or other criminal accusations, and which were generally fatal either to the accuser or the accused; for if the vanquished was not slain in the lists he was deemed guilty, and executed accordingly. Plebeians sometimes thus entered the lists, fighting with quarter-staves, to the extremities of which sandbags were appended. Such combats occurred even at a later date, for Grafton records that, in the year 1524, an armourer's servant appealed his master of treason, and fought under the superintendence of the duke of Norfolk, marshal of England, at Smithfield. On this occasion the armourer, who had taken too much malmsey and aqua-vitæ to keep up his courage, was vanquished; and though the old chroniclers assert that he was innocent of the crime alleged against him, "being but a coward and a wretch, he was drawn to Tyburn, and there hanged and beheaded."

Social and Domestic Usages.—At this period the nobles were still accompanied by numerous retinues. By some historians this usage is attributed to their hospitality. That might have been a feature in their character, but other motives induced them to surround themselves with followers. During the wars of the Roses, especially, it was their interest to strengthen the cause they espoused, as well as to secure their own personal safety, by crowding their castles with numerous retainers. It is related of Warwick, the king-maker, that he maintained thirty thousand men at his different castles and manors, and that on one occasion when he was in London, as long as he sojourned there six oxen were consumed by his attendants at breakfast, and every tavern was full of his meat. In his whole establishment the noble vied with the monarch, for besides armed retainers, he had his privy councillors, treasurers, secretaries, chaplains, choristers, stewards, pages, mimics, rope-dancers, jugglers, tumblers, and buffoons. The etiquette of a nobleman's family was an exact copy of the royal household, and the pomp and splendour of their living was but little inferior to that of the greatest kings of the period.

And sometimes they acted *as* kings, exhibiting not only pomp but power. An incident, which occurred in 1469, will well illustrate this assertion. In the autumn of that year the little town of Framlingham

capital was engaged in cloth making, in their own cottage. And they were taken under the special protection of the laws. The dealings of the clothmaker and his workmen were regulated by statute. The truck system was especially forbidden. The workpeople were not to be paid partly in "pins, girdles, and other unprofitable wares;" but were to receive for their labour their full wages in the lawful money of the realm. On the other hand, the clothmaker was equally protected, for he was not to give out wool beyond its proper weight, and every clothworker was to perform his duty in his occupation. During this period, a great number of statutes were made for the improvement of clothing arts; from which statutes it is evident that the woollen manufacture had, long before its close, become the most important branch of industry, producing not only sufficient cloths of various kinds for home consumption, but for exportation. This change, so beneficial to the industrial classes of England and so conducive to its wealth, was not looked upon with a favourable eye by foreign potentates. Thus, partly from political antipathy, but chiefly from jealousy of the prosperity of the woollen manufacture of England, the duke of Burgundy, in the reign of Edward IV., ordained that all woollen cloths should be banished out of his land; and Edward, perceiving that this measure was detrimental to the interests of the weavers, fullers, dyers, carders, spinners, and winders of yarn, adopting the anti-commercial spirit of the duke, prohibited the importation of all merchandizes of all his lands upon pain of forfeiture. But this anti-commercial spirit was universal; all classes of society partaking of it, from the highest to the lowest. They were willing, indeed, to export, but very unwilling to reciprocate. The grand idea of the period was to protect native labour from foreign competition. Thus, during this period, the arts of spinning, throwing, and weaving silk were brought into England, and practised in London by a company of "silk women;" and although they produced no great quantities, a petition was presented by them to parliament, A.D. 1455, representing that the Lombards and other Italians imported such quantities of silk thread, ribands, and laces, that they were in danger of being reduced to poverty, whereupon there was an act passed against their importation, for that it caused "great idleness amongst young gentlewomen and other apprentices of the same crafts, and the laying down of many good and notable households of them that have occupied the same crafts, which be convenient, worshipful, and according for gentlewomen and other women of worship." There was a continual clamour throughout the period for protection, which was readily accorded; and yet, judging from the preambles to most of the protecting acts, men and women of manual occupations were always coming to poverty, and were not able to live "by their mysteries." The grand secret that in free trade lies the wealth of nations had certainly not yet been discovered: a truth which will be well illustrated in the succeeding section on commerce.

SECTION II.

Commerce.—The rule of the House of Lancaster was rather unfavourable to the interests of the national industry. During that rule trade met with many obstructions which retarded its progress and extension. In the first instance, the long and expensive foreign wars in which its earlier kings engaged, were adverse to its growth; and when they were ended, then civil war was fruitful of mischiefs inflicted on commerce. But with all its drawbacks, commerce still continued its onward progress; slowly, but surely, making its way towards that condition of which the poet speaks when he describes it as having "put a girdle round the globe." Had the Plantagenets, however, been men of peace, they might have promoted commerce more than any other race of kings before them, for there was, during their rule, a wider intercourse with other nations than had before been known, and hence, by judicious legislation, the infancy of trade might have grown into adolescence, if not to manhood. Still, although their warlike propensities checked the growth of commerce, they did something towards keeping it in the state in which they found it, and in some instances to advance it a stage towards maturity. At all events Henry IV., in his intervals of rest from war, turned his attention to the promotion and the protection of the commerce of his subjects. In the first year of his reign, for instance, he granted letters of marque and reprisal against the earl of Holland, and issued orders to his admirals to detain all vessels and property in England, belonging to the people of Holland and Zealand, till the said earl should compel his subjects to pay certain debts owing to English creditors, which had become overdue. In that same year, Henry also summoned the governors of the several Hanse-towns, with their protector, the grand master of the Teutonic order of knights, to appear before his council, either in person or by deputy, to answer the complaints of English merchants who had represented that they were not treated so well in those towns as merchants from them were treated in England. There was a treaty in existence which fully secured the mutual protection of the merchants of England and of the Hanse-towns, which both appear to have infringed, for each complained of the other before the council, and gave in high estimates of the damages they had sustained; and, in the end, the dispute was settled by Henry paying 15,595 gold nobles to the grand master, and 416 to the magistrates of Hamburgh; while the grand master, on the other hand, paid only 766 to the English sufferers. It may be concluded from this that the mischiefs inflicted on the Hanse-town merchants by the English preponderated. Among other claims these merchants demanded damages for several hundreds of their countrymen, who had been thrown overboard and drowned by the English—to which claim Henry answered that when he was made acquainted with the number, state, and condition of those who had thus lost their lives, he would cause suffrages and prayers and other wholesome remedies, profitable for their souls and acceptable to God and men, to be ordained and provided, upon condition that they would provide the like remedy for the souls of the English who had been

drowned by the people of the Hanse-towns. This peculiar claim was never satisfied; but to prevent the recurrence of such outrages, a new treaty was concluded on the basis of mutual freedom of trade and oblivion of past injuries. Treaties on the same basis of reciprocity of trade were made by Henry IV. with Portugal, Flanders, Brittany, Castile, and other countries; and the growing importance of foreign trade at this time is further indicated by the public recognition given to associated bodies of merchants who were allowed to elect governors whose functions somewhat resembled those of modern consuls, and who usually resided in the foreign country to which those who elected them traded. But with all this seeming liberty of commerce, it was fettered and shackled by restrictions. Neither the merchants nor the legislators of this period entertained any just ideas of the best means of promoting its extension. The British merchant, as a rule, was a monopolizer. Foreigners were universally considered interlopers and enemies—men who came into England for the sole purpose of enriching themselves at the expense of the native merchants. Hence, while Henry, on the one hand, entered into treaties for freedom of commerce, on the other hand, at the instigation of native merchants, restrictions were laid upon it which went far to nullify the effect of those treaties. Thus, in the 4th and 5th of this reign, it was enacted that all foreign merchants should expend all the money they received for the goods they imported in English merchandize to be exported; that they should not carry any gold or silver out of the country either in coin, plate, or bullion, under the pain of forfeiture; that all the goods they imported should be sold within the space of three months; that one merchant-stranger should not sell any goods to another merchant-stranger; and that when any foreign merchant should arrive in any port or town in England, he was to lodge with a host assigned to him, and with no one else while he remained in the country. These restrictions exhibit great jealousy towards foreign merchants, and they could not fail greatly to interfere with the freedom of commerce.

But, notwithstanding foreign merchants were thus exposed to jealousies, insults, and hardships, those companies which had been incorporated by royal charters in previous periods still existed in London and other places. And that they flourished in the midst of all they had to endure is evident; for it is on record that the merchants of the staple, in the year 1458, paid, for customs on wool, woolfels, woollen cloth, leather, tin, and lead, which they exported, no less a sum than 68,000*l.*, containing as much silver as 136,000*l.* present money. This company, however, flourishing as it was at this date, was finally ruined by competition. In the thirteenth century a company of English merchants, called the brotherhood of St. Thomas à-Becket, was established, and from that time had been working its way in the commercial world by the exportation of woollen cloth. As the manufacture of that article increased, the trade of this brotherhood also increased. At the commencement of the fifteenth century it had become a society of so much importance that, in the year 1406, Henry IV. incorporated it by a charter regulating their government and their privileges. After their incorporation, the brotherhood became a formidable rival to the merchants of the staple; for being composed of native subjects, English and Irish, it was favoured both by government and the people, so that ultimately it monopolized the chief trade in woollen cloth, and the merchants of the staple were fairly driven out of the field of English commerce.

It has been seen that in the last period all export or import of merchandize in any other ships than those of English bottoms was strictly prohibited. This law, however, was probably not very strictly enforced; for in the documents relating to the quarrel with the Hanse-towns, foreign ships are expressly mentioned as being laden with goods belonging to English merchants. At the commencement of this century, A.D. 1409, express permission was granted by Henry IV. to the merchants of Venice to bring merchandize into England and other ports of his dominions in their own vessels; and when they had sold them, to load them with English goods, and to return to their own country without let or hindrance. This permission was renewed by Henry V., who, also, at the commencement of his reign, confirmed the privileges that had been granted by his father and his predecessors to foreign merchants. But the reign of Henry V. was a blank in commercial enterprise. The warlike spirit which was engendered by his attempted conquest of France rendered the people, as a nation, averse to every peaceful pursuit. Every branch of social industry languished during this dream of glory in the blood-stained fields of France. Commerce did not suffer more, if so much, by the misgovernment of Henry VI., and the civil wars with which his reign was marked, than by the victories of his father in those fields of glory. Even the loss of France, although the English people considered it to be a calamity and a disgrace, and for which Henry VI. suffered in the loss of popular favour, was rather a gain than a loss to the nation as regards commerce. It is true that during the last years of the reign of the unfortunate Henry VI., when the kingdom was almost left without a government, and the country was one great battle-field, in which the Yorkists and and Lancastrians contended for the victory with deadly energy, foreign commerce greatly suffered; but no sooner was peace restored by the triumph of the House of York than it began to revive. Commerce had now taken such deep root that it could not receive a lasting injury—it might droop and languish under foreign and civil war, but peace was its infallible restorer to life and vigour. Edward IV. paid great attention to mercantile affairs, not only protecting and encouraging the trade of his subjects, but engaging in trade himself whereby he obtained considerable wealth. His reign is marked by many commercial treaties with foreign powers, viz., Denmark, Brittany, Castile, the Netherlands, the Hanse-towns, now comprising nearly seventy in number, Spain, and other countries. Although by the treaty of Henry IV. with the authorities of the Hanse-towns, past injuries were to be buried in oblivion, during the whole of this period they appear to have been remembered and revenged. This treaty, indeed, like others, was only made to be broken. Rather the privileges which had been granted to the

gross abundance and great discomfort. It is related that the marriage-feast of Henry IV. and his queen Jane of Navarre, consisted of three courses, three of flesh and fowls, and three of fish. But in these state banquets there were some indications of a growing refinement, for at the end of each course a dish was sometimes introduced called a subtlety, which consisted of figures in pastry made to be admired, not eaten. Each figure had a label attached to it, couched in quaint or riddling language, calculated to exercise the thinking faculties of the guests, so that intellect had at this rude period began to exercise some sway over the animal passions.

Luxurious living was not confined to the halls of princes and nobles. The monks in rich monasteries, like the rich man in the parable, "fared sumptuously every day." The cook was a most important personage in conventual establishments. Cookery was an art studied by the monks, and that brother who excelled in it was certain to be installed into that office with great unanimity. Brother Laurence Chateres, the cook of Croyland Abbey, was highly esteemed for his excellent dishes, and it is recorded by the historian of the abbey that, "prompted by the love of God and zeal for religion," he gave forty pounds for "the recreation of the convent with the milk of almonds on fish days." Nor were the secular clergy behind the monks in their love of good cheer. Some of them even pressed religion itself into the service of gormandizing by the institution of what they very properly termed their "glutton masses," in honour of the virgin. These glutton masses were celebrated five times a year. Early in the morning of the festival, the people repaired to the church laden with meats and drinks, and no sooner was the mass mumbled over than the feast commenced, in which both the clergy and the laity freely indulged. The church was turned into a tavern, and there was rioting and drunkenness before the altar, unchecked and uncondemned. Nay, the priests and people of the different villages and towns entered into formal contests as to which should get up the greatest glutton-mass, that is, as to which congregation could eat and drink most in honour of the holy virgin.

The most celebrated feast of the clergy recorded at this period was that given at the installation of George Neville, brother of the earl of Warwick, when he was created archbishop of York. The consumption of meats and drinks on this occasion savours of the marvellous. The substantial part of the entertainment consisted of 104 oxen, 6 wild bulls, 1000 sheep, 3004 calves, 304 swine, 2000 pigs, 500 stags, bucks, and roes, and 204 kids. Of fowls of various kinds, both wild and tame, common and rare, there were 22,512, and of pikes and breams 308. Of made dishes —pasties, tarts, custards, and jellies— there were 20,500, and 300 quarters of wheat formed the vegetable portion of the feast. Nor were liquids wanting, for there were 300 tons of ale, 100 tons of wine, and 1 pipe of hippocras. Among the most curious items of this regal bill of fare were cranes, herons, porpoises, and seals, articles of food not considered delicacies at the present day; and it is singular that, though many of the articles must have been procured from far and near, no mention is made of the turkey.

According to Sir John Fortescue the common people did not fare amiss in these voracious times. They had, he says, plenty of all kinds of fish and flesh, and among other circumstances of plenty he mentions that they never drank water except by way of penance, and "from a principle of devotion." But this description was probably intended for persons who lived in the richest parts of the country, and had reference more especially to years of plenty, for as during the civil wars tillage was neglected and famines were common, it cannot be supposed that the poorer classes generally had an abundance of provisions. At all times, indeed, their bread was coarse and brown, and in times of scarcity it is on record that many endeavoured to subsist on the dried roots of herbs which they converted into a kind of bread, from which unwholesome food many perished. Contrary to the present practice, the meals of the poorer classes were taken at later hours than those of the rich and noble, for they breakfasted at eight in the morning, dined at twelve, and supped at six in the evening.

Concerning the cookery of this period very little is known. It may, however, be stated from what is known, that while it was still coarse, it was both complex and costly. Its complex and costly character may be illustrated from a book entitled, 'The Forme of Cury,' which is still extant, and which, though it refers to the reign of Richard II., was no doubt the cook's guide in this century. A few receipts will suffice to give the reader an idea of what appeared on the tables of the rich in the form of made dishes. A choice dish was that of what is called egurdouce. "Take," says this book of instruction, "rabbits or kids, and smite them in pieces raw, and fry them in white grease; take currants and fry them; take onions, parboil, and hew them small, and fry them; take red wine, sugar, with pepper, ginger, cinnamon, salt, and cast thereto, and let it seethe with a good quantity of white grease, and serve it forth." Another receipt instructs how to make "mawmauny." Here it is. "Take cheese, and of flesh of capons or hens, and bruise them small in a mortar, take milk of almonds, with the broth of fresh beef, and set them on the fire. Thicken it with the flour of rice, or fine bread, or fine white flour, as stiff as blank desire, and with yolks of eggs, and saffron to make it yellow, and when it is in the dish stick cloves, and strew powder of galengale—a composition of spices—over it and serve it forth." How to make a "tartee," which seems to have been a sort of patty, is thus described:—"Take sodden pork, bruise it, put eggs thereto, raisins, sugar, and ginger, sweet powder, and small birds, and white grease; take prunes, saffron, and salt, make a crust, put it thereon, and serve it forth." A more simple dish was a cold boiled pig. "Take pigs, quarter them, and boil them in salt and water; let them cool; take parsley and sage, and grind it with bread and yolks of hard boiled eggs; mix it with ginger, lay the pig in a vessel, pour on the liquor, and serve it forth." We doubt if any modern epicure will be tempted to adopt these receipts, but there can be no question that they were considered dainty dishes in this age, and were thought worthy of being adorned as became the custom with gold leaf, and powder of gold.

Furniture.—In no case was the improvements of this period more marked than in domestic furniture. It was no longer the age of cribs to sleep in and straw to repose upon. As early as the year 1415, Edward, duke of York, makes mention in his will of "a bed of feathers and leopards, with the furniture appertaining to the same," and of his "green bed embroidered with a compass." The will of Joan, Lady Bergavenny, in 1434, is still more explicit respecting the bed furniture of this period. This lady willed away three beds, which appear to have been both costly and gorgeous. First there was "a bed of gold swans with tapetter of green tapestry with branches of flowers and divers colours," with two pair of sheets of Rennes, a pair of fustains, six pairs of other sheets, six pairs of blankets, six mattresses, six pillows, and cushions and bancours belonging thereto. The second bed was of cloth of gold with leopard's cushions, tapettes of the best red worsted, and bancours belonging to the said bed. The third bed was of silk, black and red embroidered with wood-bined flowers of silver, and all the casters and apparel that belongeth thereto: namely, twelve pair of sheets of the best cloth, seven Rennes, six pair of blankets, and a pair of minever." At no period before was there such luxury displayed, as this in the sleeping-rooms of the most noble and wealthy of the community. Had the Norman kings peeped into the Lady Bergavenny's sleeping-room, they would have marvelled at such a display of taste and comfort. And the other furniture of the wealthy corresponded with the bed-furniture of the time. The "chinks which time had made" in the rough plastering of the walls were concealed with rich Arras tapestry, so called from the town of Arras, in France, where it was manufactured, of the most gorgeous description. Classically-shaped chairs, reading-desks, brass chandeliers, &c., are mentioned in this period; and Tetzee, who visited England in the reign of Edward IV., says that at a feast to which he was invited by the king, his queen, Elizabeth, sat on a golden stool at her own table. But it must not be supposed that these rare articles of furniture were common. The furniture of the houses of the esquire and the yeoman was still both scanty and mean. Sometimes a "little feather-bed" forms an important article in a will, for beds were rarely used except by the wealthy. Even tables appear to have been highly valued, for, in 1463, one John Baret, bequeathed to his niece his "round table" for the term of her natural life, and when she died it was to become the property of those who owned his house. But John Baret's "round table" might have been one of considerable value, for even in the present day wills specify valuables as heir looms. But furniture of every description must have been at that time scarce, and, therefore, valuable, for even common utensils were transmitted from generation to generation. A great earthen pot that belonged to his mother was thus left by the burgess of Bury to his niece and those who came after her; evidently conceiving that it would, brittle as it was, last for ever. As a rule, wives had a life interest in the furniture which belonged to their husbands; but after her decease it was generally willed away, article by article, to relatives and friends. Even the meanest articles, such as a pottle pot, a quart pot, pewter saucers, dishes, and platters, formed items in wills of this period, thus showing that they were considered articles of value. Some such articles were bequeathed by Roger Rokewood, of Euston, esquire, to his son Robert, and as they are mentioned in connection not only with twenty-four pounds of lawful money, but with kine and horses, it would appear that they were considered, if not of equal, yet of considerable importance. It is clear, however, that their value chiefly consisted in their scarcity; as in all ages, articles that are rare are more valuable than those which are plentiful.

Costume.—In the earlier part of this period the extravagant fashions of dress introduced by Richard II. underwent very little alteration. Fairholt thus describes the male costume of the reign of Henry IV. from two figures, representing a summer and a winter month, in the illuminations of a little calendar of the year 1411:—"The elder figure seated in his chair is an interesting example of the costume of that class of the community whose lives were in 'the sere and yellow leaf.' He wears a dark cap or hat, turned up behind only, so that it forms a projecting point or shade for the eyes in front, such hats being worn until the latter part of this period. A close-fitting hood envelopes his head and shoulders, having buttons down the front. A long gown similar to that worn during the reign of Edward II., but tighter in the sleeve, envelopes the body; it is fastened by a row of buttons in the front, and the sleeves are secured by a similar close row from the elbow. By looking at the younger figure we shall perceive that the greater excess of cloth in sleeves and gowns so glaringly visible in the previous reign had a little abated. The gown or tunic reaches only to the knee, where it is cut into the form of leaves; in the original delineation it is of a dark chocolate colour, and is secured round the waist by a close-fitting ornamental girdle. The wide sleeves are of a different colour, and are generally light when the body of the dress is dark, or *vice versâ*; the juncture at the shoulder being slightly ornamented. Tight hose, and boots reaching above the ankle, which are deprived of their enormous crackowes, or long pointed toes, finish the dress which is much less foppish than that worn during the reign of Richard II. The hair is parted in front, and curls

MALE COSTUME, HENRY IV.

at the sides; and in some instances we find the gentlemen confining their locks across the forehead by a very feminine jewelled band."

The extravagance of dress had been inveighed against by Chaucer in the last period. In his description of a fashionable he describes its superfluous expense as "proceeding from the cost of embroidery, disguised, indented, barring, crowding cloth in vanity. Also the costly furring in gowns, so much pouncing of chisel to make holes, so much dagging of shears with superfluity in length of the paling, winding, or bending, and semblable waste of gowns trailing in mire, on horse as also on foot, as well of man as of woman." The hose or lower garments of the men, however, called forth his bitter rebuke for "the horrible disordinate scantness." Sumptuary laws also were enacted to remedy the evil towards the close of the last period. But it was all to no purpose: the costume of the fashionable was still of the same extravagant description. Nor were the efforts made in the reign of Henry IV. to set bounds to its extravagance more successful. By the sumptuary laws then enacted, no person of lower estate than a knight banneret was to wear cloth of gold or velvet, or to appear in a gown that reached to the ground, or to wear large sleeves, or use upon his dress the furs of either ermine or marten; and gold and silver ornaments were strictly forbidden to all who were not possessed of two hundred pounds in goods and chattels, or twenty pounds per annum. As for gowns and garments cut into the form of leaves and other figures at the edges, or ornamented with letters or devices, they were declared forfeit to the king, and the tailor who made such fine clothes was rendered liable to imprisonment during the royal pleasure. But these sumptuary laws were disregarded by all classes of the community; in spite of them people would dress as they pleased, and tailors were found bold enough to brave the terrors of Henry's displeasure by manufacturing the prohibited finery for their customers. This is evident from the satirical poems of Occleve, who imitating his "dear muster" Chaucer, inveighed against the extravagance of the dress of the period. Thus, in a poem on the pride of serving men, and their wastefulness in clothing, he declares that he was horrified at seeing them walk in robes of scarlet twelve yards wide with sleeves hanging down to the ground, and bordered or lined with fur to the value of twenty yards or more. Occleve affirms that no merit or virtue was discerned in a man but him whose array is outrageous. Even in a man's tippet, he says there was no less than a yard of broad cloth consumed, which he denounces as "a foul waste of cloth and excessive." How such menials were to assist their masters seemed to have puzzled the poet; for if they should be suddenly assailed, he says that their two arms would have enough to do, and somewhat more to hold up their sleeves. Such serving men he declares, rendered themselves as unserviceable to their lords as women. Then in a vein of rich humour he points out what he considers to be their only utility in these words:—

"Now have these lords little need of brooms
To sweep away the filth out of the street,
Since side [wide] sleeves of pennyless grooms
Will it up lick be it dry or wet."

John Gower also laboured with his pen to reform the dress of his time, and it would appear from their effigies, that both Chaucer, Gower, and Occleve practised what they preached, for there is no extravagance visible in their costume: a long gown with short sleeves, a close hood, and a plain low crowned hat being its chief characteristics.

The female costume of the reign of Henry IV. differed but little from that of the preceding reign, except in the head-dress, which became more fantastic and elaborate. But it is in the reign of his son and successor that the head-dress of the ladies became most marked for absurdity; for then it was that the horned coiffure which was "strangely and fearfully made," first became the fashion. Against this strange head-dress the satirists of the day vented their utmost ire. It was declared by them that the ladies carried about with them the outward and visible sign of the father of all evil, proudly, triumphantly, and without shame. The poet Lydgate wrote 'A Ditty on Women's Horns,' in which he severely condemns the fashion, and calls upon them to cast their horns away on various grounds. In that ditty he declares that—

"Clerkes record by great authority,
Horns were given to beasts for defence:
A thing contrary to feminity,
To be made sturdy of resistance.
But arch wives eager in their violence,
Fierce as tigers for to make affray,
They have despite, and act against conscience,
List not to pride, then horns cast away."

In another stanza he calls upon them by the example of the Virgin Mary, whom all professed at this age to adore, and even worship, to dispense with this monstrous head-dress:—

"Mother of Jesus, mirrour of chastity,
In word or thought that never did offence,
True exemplar of virginity,
Head-spring and well of perfect continence;
There was never clerk, by rhetoric nor science
Could all her virtues rehearse until this day:
Noble princesses of meek benevolence,
Take example of her—your horns cast away."

But the ladies took no heed of the monk of Bury, for they wore their horns during the whole of the period "proudly, triumphantly, and without shame."

FEMALE COSTUME, HENRY IV.

The male costume of the reign of Henry V. varies in no essential particular from that of the two preceding reigns, except that it became the fashion to wear a baldrick slung across the person from the left shoulder reaching to the right knee, decorated in its entire length with a series of small bells hanging by loops, so that the fashionable gentleman had music at every step he took. Fairholt says that his slightest motion rivalled a team of waggon horses, to whose bells those upon his baldrick bore an exact resemblance.

The general costume from the accession of Henry VI. to the close of this period appears to have been a mixture of the fashions of the preceding reigns, with some few additions to their absurdities and extravagances. The characteristic changes are longer toes to the shoes than ever, hoods with tippets or liripies reaching to the ground, sleeves shaped like a bagpipe, high caps with a single feather behind, high padded shoulders, both to the short jacket and long gowns, and loose robes with armholes and without sleeves. There were also jackets and gowns made with long hanging sleeves, trimmed with fur, which could be worn on the arm or flung behind as the wearer fancied; and in the reign of Edward IV. the practice of slitting the doublets at the elbows, so as to show the shirt, came into fashion. Henry VI. was not guilty of patronising such enormities, for throughout life his dress accorded with his ascetic turn of mind. It was invariably plain, and we are told that he refused to wear the long pointed shoes so commonly worn by the gentry and nobility of his age. On the contrary, though sumptuary laws were passed in the reign of Edward IV., that monarch gave no personal check to the dandyism of the day by his example, thereby nullifying the enactments.

Describing a dandy of the reign of Edward IV., Fairholt says:—"He wears a tight jacket, very short, and confined at the waist by a narrow girdle, to which is appended a dagger. His sleeves are large and open at the sides, to display the shirt beneath, which is loose, and projects from between the lacings of the opening. . . The hat he wears with the single feather is one of common occurrence; and the profusion of hair forms a striking and not unpleasant contrast to the close crops of the previous reign. His tight hose are similar to the ancient chausses; and his long pointed toes, now called *poulaines*, are as indicative of dandyism as the rings on his fingers."

These *poulaines* are said to have been sometimes two feet long, and Monstrelet says that boys in France, where the fashion also prevailed, wore them, in 1467, an ell in length. The sumptuary laws of Edward IV. prohibited all persons under the estate of a squire or gentleman to wear long pointed toes to their shoes, and they were only permitted to wear them two inches in length. But though this law seems to have been obeyed, men ran into the opposite extreme, for what was taken from the length was put on the width of the toes to an absurd degree. Large sleeves were also prohibited by the sumptuary laws of Edward IV. to be worn by any yeoman or person under that degree, under a penalty of 6*s.* 8*d.*, and 20*s.* fine for the tailor who manufactured them. But the statutes of apparel passed in the reign of Edward IV. were designed more to mark the classes of society than to diminish the extravagance of the fashions of the age. The nobles might still indulge in the luxury of dress; the squire and the gentlemen with 40*l.* a year might indulge in damask or satin; and the class below them — men who had obtained position by wealth, and those who had 40*l.* of yearly value — might rejoice in furs, and their wives in gilt girdles; but the yeoman and persons under his degree were debarred from furs, and fustian, and scarlet cloth, and were to have no stuffing in their doublets, while servants in husbandry and artificers were not to wear any cloth which cost more than 2*s.* the broad yard. No man under the estate of a lord was to wear cloth of foreign manufacture, and no one, however high in rank, was to wear cloth of gold or silk of a purple colour except the royal family.

The hats of this period were of various shapes. There was the hat of black cloth, with a long pendant twisted round the neck; the high crowned hat, with a jewelled band and a broad white rim, turned up; the skull-crowned hat, with a gilt band and buttons; and the sugar-loaf-shaped hat of red cloth or velvet, which, with the bushy hair of the wearer, stretched out on each side of the head gave it the appearance of

MALE COSTUME, EDWARD IV.

FEMALE COSTUME, EDWARD IV.

a pyramid. Long hair was worn by all classes. In the figure even of a beggar of this period, from the quantity of hair it exhibits, it is evident that in this respect, however tattered and plain his costume may have been, he sought to rival a gentleman.

In the early sumptuary laws of this period, as in those of the preceding age, restrictions were laid on female costume; but by the laws of Edward IV. the dress of the ladies was left untouched. It was especially provided by the act of 1483, that it was not to extend or be "prejudicial to or for any woman except the wives of servants and labourers." Either Edward was too gallant to legislate against velvet and satin, girdle or coverchief, or it had been found vain to legislate against the omnipotence of female taste, for it is plain from this that they were left to their own wills in matters of array, to dress gorgeously or not, as they pleased. During the reigns of Henry VI. and Edward IV., the head-dresses of the ladies became more abominable than ever. In spite of all that could be said by satirist, moralist, or preacher, their horns became more and more exalted. But there were other fashionable head-dresses at this time, as the heart-shaped, and the tall steeple cap, over which a gauze veil was worn, which partly covered the face. The form of the dress appears to have been different from that worn in the reign of Henry V., being open from the neck to the waist in front, and having a turn over collar, which was generally of a dark colour. The gowns were frequently bordered with fur to a considerable depth, and they were so capacious, that when the wearer went out for a walk she was obliged to fold the skirts over her arm. The waist was ridiculously short, and was bound by a broad band, and the cuffs of the sleeves were wide, and reached to the base of the fingers. A broad edge or band ran round the dress, the fashionable colour of which was white. The shoe of the lady was long and narrow-pointed, peeping forth from the long dress by which it was partly hidden like the sheath of a dagger.

It would appear that even at this date Paris set the fashion. Monstrelet relates that Thomas Conecte, a perambulating preaching friar, commenced so determined a crusade against the steeple head-dresses of the ladies in France, that none dared appear in them in his presence. Conecte called in the little boys of France to aid him in his crusade, for he gave them certain days of pardon to torment and plague all who appeared in public in the obnoxious head-dress. Thus stimulated to mischief, the young urchins, whenever they saw a lady thus adorned, attempted to pull down the "steeple," which gave rise to tumults between them and the lady's servants. For a time this crusade had the desired effect; for the holy father had the satisfaction of seeing the ladies bring their head-gear to him, which he remorselessly burnt in a fire kindled before his pulpit in the principal square of Paris. "But," adds Monstrelet, "this reform did not last long, for, like as snails, when any one passes by them, draw in their horns, and when all danger seems over, put them forth again, so these ladies, shortly after the preacher had quitted their country, forgetful of his doctrine *and abuse*, began to resume their former head-dresses, and wore them even higher than before."

Towards the close of the reign of Edward IV. the head-dress of the ladies took another form. The steeple-cap gave place generally to a velvet cowl, which was turned back upon the forehead, and hung in plaits behind upon the neck, or with a caul of gold net. This resembled the cowl worn in the reign of Henry IV., but it differed in this respect, that it was ornamented with two wings of gauze or other transparent material, which projected like those of a butterfly. This fashion was pretty generally adopted, and especially in the brief reign of Richard III. Gentlemen also began to wear long gowns, and a costume shorn of many of the extravagances which had characterised the dress of the period.

But although the apparel of this period is represented as extravagant, both as regards fashion and material, it was not abundant. The wills of the period show that the wardrobes of the gentry and the burgesses were not overstocked with clothing, and that what they possessed was carefully treasured up. Their suits were not worn once or twice, as sometimes they are at the present day, and then thrown aside to be worn no more, or perchance sent back to the tailor in part payment of the next Christmas bill for clothing. On the contrary, in the wills of the period, we find one testator leaving to a friend a short gown, "a good one which is convenient for him," together with his russet hood; another desiring that a neighbour's

MALE COSTUME, HENRY VI.

FEMALE COSTUME, HENRY VI.

wife should have "my best lined gown and my cloak;" and a third bestowing "a doublet and a pair of hosen." Bravery of apparel was no doubt a great point with the higher classes, but they could not afford to throw it away. They even pinched themselves frequently to obtain their costly garments. The importance attached to them no doubt arose from their comparative dearness. According to the statute, the coarse cloth of a labourer's dress was not to exceed two shillings per year, an amount which would answer to thirty shillings present money. However broad the cloth might have been, even a working man's dress would require a considerable outlay, and the dress of a gentleman, therefore, would require a far greater expenditure of money. It is on record, indeed, that the cost of the fine array of a gentleman at this period, together with that of his servants and the trappings of his horses, sometimes reduced him to a state of penury.

The ecclesiastical costume of this period underwent no material alteration. From the pages of the satirists, however, we learn that though some of the clergy preached against the extravagant dress of the laity, as a body, they were not slow in imitating their example. The vestments used in the Church service were magnificent; rivalling in splendour and costliness that of the nobility or royalty. In private life some of the higher clergy wore dresses similar to the nobles, cutting them at the edges into the leaves and "jags" so much condemned by the graver moralists. A "ballad against excess in apparel, especially in the clergy," preserved in the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum, and which was most probably written in the reign of Edward IV., thus reproves them for their pride in dress:—

"Ye unholy priests full of presumption,
With your wide furred hoods void of discretion;
Unto your own preaching of contrary condition,
Which causeth the people to have less devotion.

Advanced by simony in cities and towns,
Make shorter your tails and broader your crowns;
Leave your short stuff'd doublets, and your pleated gowns,
And keep your own houses, and pass not your bounds.

Reprove not other men: I shall tell you why
Ye be so lewd yourself, there setteth no man you by;
It is but a shame that ye be called holy,
For worse disposed people liveth not under the sky.

First tree yourselves, who now to sin be bound:
Leave sin and fear it: then may ye take in hand
Others to reprove, and then I understand
Ye may amend all others, and bring peace to the land."

These verses apply chiefly to the higher clergy, the prelates, and the abbots of the day; but the monumental effigies of the period prove that some of the dignitaries of the Church did not deserve the satirist's censure, for they represent them as being very plainly attired in a long flowing gown devoid of all ornament. The plain parish priest appears to have been ordinarily habited in a long gown edged with fur, and to have worn a plain cap on his head; but the monk was more luxurious in his costume, for he had wide sleeves to his gown edged with fur, and he wore a hood and a long pendent tippet, which laid him open to the satirist's rebuke. Moreover, he wore an ornamental girdle to which a purse was attached formed of velvet and ornamented with tassels of gold thread, the framework and clasps being made of metal, gilt, or of silver.

Of the military costume of the reigns of Henry IV. and V., Fairholt observes it had "arrived at a perfection of richness and beauty unsurpassed by that worn at any other period. The effigies of those knights remaining to us, whose prowess stirred the nation and achieved immortality for themselves and honour for their fatherland, are worthy examples of the heroes of chivalry—supplying all that the painter can wish to possess in the way of material for his resuscitation of the days that saw their noble achievements."

It was in the reign of Henry V. that the most important changes took place in the armour worn by English warriors. The full-length figure of Robert Chamberlain, esquire to Henry, is thus graphically described by Fairholt:—"He is putting up a prayer to heaven in the conventional form of a scroll, which is received by a hand from the clouds. The costume is very curious and valuable, as it depicts many novelties as well as the lingering remains of older fashions; the bascinet rises to a point upon which is placed a hollow tube to receive the *panache*, or group of feathers, which now nodded gracefully above the head of the warrior. The vizor bears some resemblance to that worn in the reign of Richard II.; while the camail carries us back to the days of the Black Prince. The body of the knight is entirely covered by a tight-fitting jupon, embroidered all over with foliated ornaments, the chain mail worn beneath appearing below it. A girdle crosses the hips having

LAW COSTUMES.

a jewelled centre, enamelled with the letter R in the midst—his sword and dagger are affixed to it. The armour of the legs, like that of the arms, is of solid plate, dovetailed at the junctures. The long-toed sollerets and extravagantly large rowelled spurs are equally characteristic of this period."

About this time the armour became ornamented with rich chasing round the edges of the gloves, the mamelières, the elbow, and knee-pieces; its general effect being that of gorgeous security. But, if we may believe Froissart, the gorgeousness of the armour was sometimes the cause of the warrior's destruction when taken prisoner; for he relates that Raymond, the nephew of Pope Clement, when captured by his enemies, was put to death for the sake of the dazzling shell in which he had enveloped himself. Some of the English knights at this period wore a rich jewelled wreath called an *orle* around the bascinet; and occasionally long and wide sleeves were worn over the armour upon which they were fastened to the shoulder, their edges being frequently cut into the shape of leaves or escallops.

The archers and cross-bowmen of this period were the pride of the English army. It was by them rather than by the gorgeously mailed knights that Henry V. won the battles of Agincourt and Cressy. It was no wonder, therefore, that he valued their services and took especial care of them. The sheriffs of the counties were obliged to provide them with feathers from the wings of geese, plucking six from each goose. The armour of the archers consisted of jazerine jackets, which was composed of small overlapping plates of iron covered with velvet or cloth, and sometimes ornamented with brass. Chain mail jackets were occasionally worn beneath that called the jazerine. The archers were generally protected by large shields or pavisers, which were pointed at bottom, and reached to their shoulders, behind which, when the pointed head was affixed in the earth before them, they were well secured from the arrows of the enemy. Their helmets, called salades, which came into use in the reign of Henry VI., were of two forms; one covering the head and eyes, and the other having a moveable visor. In this reign a new form of shield was introduced, which is described as being a mean or middle weapon between the buckler and the round target; some persons holding it on the thigh, and others with the arm drawn back close to the breast. In the reign of Henry VI. plates called tuilles, which depended from the skirts of the armour over an apron of chain mail, were first introduced. Another fashion which prevailed was that of wearing a tabard over the armour, richly emblazoned with the armorial bearings of the knight. At this time, also, the breast-plate was frequently composed of two pieces, the lower piece, called the placard, being fastened to the upper about the centre with a screw or ornamental buckle. These plates were sometimes covered with silk of various colours, but occasionally the upper plate only was covered, the placard being exposed so as to give the wearer the appearance of being only half armed.

The arms of this period were various. First there was the mace, with which all heavy armed men were supplied during this and the succeeding century. This instrument of war was hung at the saddle bow, and was used to break the armour of an opponent and destroy him by a blow, or else to ward off a stroke from his sword. A horseman's hammer, or short battle-axe, sometimes took the place of that formidable weapon. Another weapon was the hand cannon which had a touch-hole at the top, and which were the originals of our musketry. Hand-guns and battle-axes were sometimes united, and these appear to have had a pan at the side of the touch-hole to prevent the escape of the powder. A weapon called the *guisarme*, commonly used by foot-soldiers in attacks on cavalry, combined the spear with the scythe, which rendered it very formidable. The bill was of various forms; that which was united in the reign of Richard III. had a hook at the side to seize the bridle of the horse. The large two-handed sword was a conspicuous weapon in the reigns of Edward IV. and Richard III. The swordsmen who used them were formidable foes. Staying themselves upon one foot, they fetched a full circle with great swiftness, and down came the blow with resistless force. An old romance of the period, speaks of a warrior who

> "With his two hande sworde
> He made such paye
> That syxty lay on the field."

Other instruments of war were the ordinary sword, the *janetaire*, a kind of Spanish lance, and the halbert, still used in our armies.

BLACK ARMOUR KNIGHT.

Features of Society.—As this age presented some remarkable features in society, it may be well to notice a few of the most prominent. As regards superstition, that continued as rife as in the preceding ages, for when men were taught by the priesthood to

place their hopes of the Divine favour on the pardons of a priest, the patronage of a saint, pilgrimages, fastings, &c., it could not be expected that they would rise superior to the teachings they imbibed. They were bound hand and foot in the iron chains of superstition, and though Wicklyffe and his followers, and, above all, the press, had come to their rescue, the age died away before, as a people, they were delivered from their thraldom. The credulity of the age was marvellous. A contemporary historian boldly asserts that there was not a man in all England who doubted the reality of the black arts, as sorcery and necromancy. Any miracle related by the monks and priests as having been performed, however improbable in its various details, was received by the credulous multitude as Gospel truth. Nor was their credulity confined to the belief in miracles. There were prophets in those days; or if there were not, Comines says, and that truly, that the English had a prophecy ready to produce on every occasion, though it would appear that they were generally produced when the fulfilment could be so coupled with it that no one could gainsay its rationality. Thus, when, Edward IV. and Louis XI. met on the bridge of Picquiny to treat for peace, Comines says that the bishop of Ely, chancellor of England, in his harangue to the two monarchs, told them—and no doubt he knew which way the wind blew—that the English had a prophecy to the effect that there would be a great peace concluded between France and England, and by the issue of that celebrated meeting the prophecy, if any, was fulfilled.

One feature of English manners at this period was the bad habit of swearing in common conversation. All over Europe they were noted for their profanity. Englishmen, it is said, were called on the continent, from one expression they were accustomed to use, "Goddammees." Though there were a hundred thousand more "Goddammees" in France, said the Maid of Orleans to the earls of Warwick and Stafford, who visited her in her prison at Rouen, they will never conquer France. But it is probable that the habit of swearing was more conspicuous among the military than among civilians, for it was with that class that the people on the continent had chiefly come into contact. Ancient Pistol uttered "brave words on the bridge," and there can be no doubt that the culpable practice of swearing was common among the military. It must be confessed, however, that the practice was not confined to the soldiery. Some of the Plantagenet monarchs were not very choice in their language when their fiery spirits were ruffled; and Otterbourne mentions it as remarkable that Henry VI. did not swear in common conversation, but reproved his ministers and officers of state when he heard them uttering oaths.

Another remarkable feature of society in this period was the incessant litigation. "A little learning is a dangerous thing" received an apt illustration long before Pope oracularly pronounced his truism. Every gentleman at this time had some little knowledge of the law, which too frequently led him into its meshes. Sons were enjoined by their parents to learn the law that they might be able to defend themselves. Hence it arose that clients in this age were as familiar with every legal quibble as the counsel and attorneys. A curious case is recorded of a quibble about a letter which caused a lawsuit extending over thirty-six years—rivalling many of the cases in Chancery of modern times. A defendant alleged that he lived at Raytheby, and not at Ratheby as set forth in the case; whereupon the suit was prolonged from the 21st of Richard II. to the 12th of Henry VI. But the manner in which cases were litigated will be better illustrated by that of Philip FitzEustace, who, in the year 1397, was sued for breaking into a close of the manor of Hawsted—belonging to Sir William Clopton—and cutting down trees and carrying off goods and chattels. FitzEustace pleaded that the manor belonged to him; but after ten years' litigation, judgment was given against him for his wrong-doing. But the dispute was not yet settled. Twenty years after the original suit was settled, William Clopton, esquire, probably the son of Sir William, who was then in possession of the said manor, was summoned by a writ of John, duke of Bedford, constable of England, addressed to John, duke of Norfolk, marshal of England, to answer in the Court of Chivalry to Robert Eland, in the county of Lincoln, by whom he was charged with putting his seal of arms to a false and feigned name. The powers of the Court of Chivalry were at this time but a phantom, and William Clopton, esquire, appears to have taken no further notice of the summons to appear before its tribunal than by bringing an action against Robert Eland and others for having published and read two deeds claiming the manor of Hawsted upon the allegation that the deeds so read were false. The matter was finally settled by arbitration; the award being that the arbitrators having examined the principal at their leisure, and "seen it in the sun," the deed was an old one, but new rased and rewritten. There appears to have been no end to the causes of litigation at this period—that of the stopping up of footpaths being one of the most frequent. It has been argued that the constant appeal to the law is a proof that it was righteously administered, but this is not borne out by historical data. Oaths were little regarded at this period, although various ceremonies were invented to give them additional solemnity and secure their observation; and if the nobles set such an evil example, it cannot be wondered at that the poorer classes were commonly addicted to perjury. We are distinctly told that not a few of the common people lived by swearing for hire in courts of justice. It is true juries were sometimes especially exhorted to "do as conscience will, and eschew perjury;" but there is evidence to show that juries were paid and feasted after they had delivered their verdicts, which indicates corruption. Some of the statutes of this period point directly to the corruption which existed. Thus, in the statutes of 1426, sheriffs were accused of taking large sums of money for allowing bail to persons apprehended, and in those of 1439 they are distinctly charged with making favourable panels of juries for reward. But no statutes could remedy the evil, for official bribery was not considered a personal degradation, and the highest in the court did not disdain to take a bribe when offered even by a foreign enemy. When Lord Hastings, the high chamberlain of England, was offered two thousand crowns of gold by the

agent of Louis XI., king of France, he said he did not desire such a gift, but he might "put it into his sleeve." It was equally vain to endeavour to prevent litigation by statute law. The evil was attributed to the number of attorneys, and hence, in the year 1455, there was an enactment passed which had for its object the limitations of the numbers, especially in Norfolk and Suffolk, where common attorneys appear to have abounded, going about, according to the preamble of the statute, "to every fair and market and other places where is any assembly of people, exhorting, procuring, moving, and inciting the people to attempt untrue suits for small trespasses, little offences, and small debts," which actions were triable in Courts Baron. It was ordered by this statute that there should only be six attorneys in each of the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk, and two in Norwich; but we do not find that their numbers were diminished; if they were it had no effect in decreasing the amount of litigation, for it prevailed during the whole of the period. The age was pre-eminently one of law-suits, and too frequently the law which should have been exercised for the protection of society was turned into an engine of oppression and violence. Numerous instances of this maladministration of the law are recorded in the 'Paston Letters,' from which we gather that it was a common practice of a debtor to avoid the payment of what he owed to get an outlawry issued against his creditor; and that sometimes legal proceedings were taken clandestinely and decrees issued depriving individuals of their property before they were aware that their titles were called into question. Yet with all its wrong-doing the authority of the law was as much respected as it is at the present day, and, when rightly exerted, it was sufficiently potent to protect life and property. At all events we do not find any savage enactments against "sturdy vagabonds and valiant beggars in great routs and companies," as were passed in the subsequent period of the Tudors. That there were robbers in this age there can be no question, but it is clear that they were not allowed to go unpunished; for Sir John Fortescue, chief justice of the King's Bench in the reign of Henry VI., has it on record that more men were hanged in England in one year for robbery and manslaughter than there were during seven years in France. Sir John adduces this as a proof of the superior courage of the English, three or four of whom, he says, would set upon seven or eight true men and rob them all, whereas the French had "no hearts to do so terrible an act."

Some glimpses are obtained from the 'Paston Letters' respecting the position of females in the arrangement of a family during the reign of Henry VI. and Edward IV. From those letters, which Mr. Hallam designates as a "precious link in the chain of the moral history of England," we gather that daughters were subjected to a strict discipline; and that other females besides the daughters were educated in the houses of the gentry—the claims of blood demanding and obtaining protection for those without fortune. In matters of love and matrimony daughters were greatly under the control of their parents; but sometimes, as in the present day, they rebelled and married the man of their choice. It was in vain that the Paston family, well regulated as it appears to have been, endeavoured to break off a contract which one daughter had made with a person beneath her in station: in spite of opposition they were eventually married. Madam Paston's cousin, Elizabeth Clere, also had a will of her own, for although Queen Margaret sent for her and desired her to have a husband of her choice, and one who seems to have set his heart upon the said Elizabeth, she refused to accept him as her lover. And there seems to have been good reason sometimes for a lady to have her own way, for the knight of those days was a different personage to the knight of old who knelt at the feet of his mistress and challenged all comers to the tournament to produce her equal in beauty and virtue. A mercenary spirit prevailed among the lovers of this period. If a knight sought a lady, he ascertained what portion she would have, and bargained for the uttermost crown—a circumstance which, no doubt, sometimes led to a breach of good feeling between him and his lady-love. On the other hand, however, females had an eye to wealth, for mothers were in the habit of soliciting powerful persons to interest themselves to obtain a good match for their daughters. But after all, according to the 'Paston Letters,' if a young woman had some accomplishments, and could "use herself to work readily as other gentlewomen do, and somewhat to help herself," she had no great difficulty in finding an eligible partner. The work which a married lady was called upon to do was manifold. It did not simply consist in sewing, spinning, and looking to her household affairs, but when her husband was away in the battle-field, or looking after his lawsuits in London, or enjoying the pastimes of hunting and hawking, she had to rule his retainers, look after his farms, and to make hard bargains with his tenants. When once united, there appears to have been no need of a Court of Divorce to dissolve the nuptial tie, for the age is characterised, with all its barbarisms, by great conjugal fidelity.

Sports and Pastimes.—The sports of the nobility and gentry differed but little in this age from that of the preceding. Those of the field, indeed, have been the favourite diversions of persons of rank and fortune for many successive ages, and the love of them has not yet died away. Tilts and tournaments, which had in this period become degenerated, are now things of the past; but hunting still holds its sway among our modern nobles and gentlemen. But the hunting of the present day is a different pastime, in its main features, to that of the fifteenth century. In the drawings of the period, nobles, priests, and ladies are represented in their hunting costumes with bows which, in size and weight, appear to have resembled those handled by the bold outlaws of Sherwood Forest. But their sport was only a mimicry of that which was the custom of the Norman period, for at this time a system of hunting in enclosures was adopted by which the labour of the chase was avoided. It was a kind of battue-hunting, for sheds were erected under which the hunters stood and shot at the beasts of game which were driven from the parks or forests in which they were enclosed, so as to be compelled to pass within the range of their arrows. Hawking, also, was still as favourite a pastime as ever. In the 'Paston Letters'

a knight is represented as desiring that a hawk might be procured for his amusement, as he was dying "in default of labour." The nobility seemed to have been miserable without active exercise. If not engaged in military exercise, hunting, or hawking, men of rank, and more especially the young, often engaged in more ignoble sports, such as running, wrestling, pitching the bar, and throwing spears. Games at handball were also favourite amusements among persons of rank and fortune, who played with the ball on horseback as well as on foot for large sums of money.

Mumming still formed a part of the amusements of the wealthy, the greatest and highest persons in the state often taking a part in its fooleries. The drawings of the period represent those who engaged in these ridiculous masquerades dressed in buckram, and vizors in imitation of wild men and women, birds, beasts, angels, and devils. The splendid pageantries with which English kings were occasionally received in London were a species of mumming on a grander scale. Such was the pageantry with which Henry VI. was greeted on his return from the victory of Agincourt. When he arrived at London Bridge he found two turrets erected, in front of which stood a huge giant form who welcomed him home again in verse composed for the occasion. On the top of one of these turrets stood a lion and an antelope, and on the other a troop of men representing angels, who sang merrily as he passed over the drawbridge, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Reaching Cornhill, Henry found a tower erected on which stood numerous patriarchs, who chanted, "Sing unto the Lord: praise his name in the holy church;" and arriving at the Conduit in Chepe, representations of the twelve Apostles sang, "Have mercy on us, O Lord!" A host of "angels" also greeted him with "Noble! noble!" from a castle erected on the cross of "Chepe," after which he entered St. Paul's to listen to a joyful Te Deum. This pageant was sufficiently absurd and profane; but that with which his son and successor, the unfortunate Henry VI., was greeted on his return from his coronation as king of France at Paris, was, with all its magnificence, in some of its features blasphemous, and in others of too revolting a character to appear in the page of history.

The theatrical amusements of the age were secular plays, and what were called Mysteries. These, indeed, had characterized the preceding period, but they now became more common and more extensively patronized. Those which were called secular plays were, however, little better than the extemporaneous sallies of itinerant buffoons, who exercised their wit and powers of mimicry for the amusement of low company wherever they could find an audience willing to listen to them and pay them for their drolleries. That species of dramatic performance called the "Mystery" was most in favour; kings, nobles, and ecclesiastical dignitaries taking a delight in them as keen as enthusiastic playgoers do at the present day in the immortal dramas of Shakspeare. The good town of Coventry was famous for these exhibitions, people from all parts of the kingdom thronging thither at the Christmas and Whitsun holidays to witness their performance. The Mysteries were dramatic representations derived from the Bible, such as the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Nativity and Crucifixion of Christ, and even the Day of Judgment. They were performed in the street, or in the churchyard on a stage which consisted of three platforms. On the highest platform there was a profane representation of the Creator surrounded by holy angels; the middle platform was occupied by saints and glorified men; and the lower contained actors who acted the part of mortals in their then state of existence. Sometimes the devil and infernal spirits were brought on the stage, as is evident from the items that have been preserved of the cost of particular plays. In Sharp's Dissertation on these pageants these curious items are recorded:—"Paid for two pound of hayre for the Divill's head, 3*s.*; mending his hose, 8*d.*; black canvas for shirts for the damned, 4*s.*; red buckram for the wings of angels, who were represented by naked children, 7*s.*; and for a cote and a pair of gloves for God, 3*s.*" No cost was spared in getting up these representations, for the more magnificently they were got up, the more they attracted attention. As may be supposed, the dialogue was written by the clergy, who, indeed, devised the whole of the pageant. But the dialogue was generally rude, with very little plot, and the whole formed a succession of scenes rather than a connected story. One of those acted at Coventry will well illustrate their character; namely, a pageant of the Birth of Christ and offering of the Magi, which also included the Flight into Egypt and Murder of the Innocents. The actors and managers of these pageants at Coventry were the trading companies or guilds, and this particular pageant was prepared by and at the expense of the shearmen and tailors. The piece opened with the music of the harp and the sound of the trumpet, in the midst of which Israel appeared prophesying the blessing that awaited mankind. A long interval of time was then passed over in silence, for the next actor who took his part in the mystery was Gabriel, who came to announce to Mary her share in the coming salvation of the human race. This was followed by a conversation between Mary and her husband, Joseph; after which preparations were made for the appearance of the wonderful stranger. At this point of the pageant some poetic feeling is thrown into it. There were shepherds scattered about who were cold and heavy in spirit, when suddenly a star appeared, and the song of *Gloria in excelsis Deo* was heard from the angels on the upper platform. Then followed three songs, the singers being the shepherds, and women who represented the Hebrew mothers lamenting over the cruel edict which Herod had issued for the destruction of the babes of Bethlehem. In the lament are these stanzas, which afford a specimen of the poet's skill in numbers:—

"O Sisters two, how may we do
For to preserve this day,
These poor younglings, for whom we do sing,
By, by, lully lullay.

Herod, the King, in his raging,
Charged he hath this day,
The men of might in his own sight
All young children to slay.

That woe is me poor child for thee,
And ever mourn and say,
For thy parting, neither say nor sing
By, by, lully, lullay."

After this, the shepherds were guided to the crib where lay the infant representing Jesus, to whom they made their offerings, one presenting him with his pipe, another his hat, and a third his mittens! After this appeared certain prophets, who, in order to enhance the humility of the King of kings who lay in his "crib of poor repast," came declaring that he would not be born in hall, or castle, or tower. Herod's messenger came next, and then Herod with three kings, who vainly endeavoured to induce him to recall his cruel decree. Then came the finale: the infants were slaughtered, or supposed to be so; but in the meantime, the infant Jesus was safe on his journey towards his place of refuge, Egypt.

Profane as such representations appear to modern readers—and by some they were condemned as such at the period in which they were acted—there can be no doubt that by the Romish clergy, and the people generally, they were deemed an innocent and even a pious amusement. And they may have had the effect of impressing some truths recorded in Scripture on the minds of their audiences in an age when printing was unknown, of which they would otherwise have been ignorant, or, at least, have been unmindful. It was teaching through the senses, which, in that dark age, was more potent than plain words spoken from the pulpit. As a recent writer has acutely observed:—"There is abundant evidence that the Romish ecclesiastics in their first introduction of this kind of representations, especially that part of them relating to the birth, passion, and resurrection of Christ, had the perfectly serious intention of strengthening the faith of the multitude in the fundamental doctrines of their Church; and it seems the less extraordinary that they should have resorted to this expedient, when we reflect, that before the invention of printing, books had no existence for the people at large. But it is no less certain that the representation of these exhibitions rapidly worked upon the popular mind an effect, which it is likely the priestly dramatists themselves had not contemplated in the first instance: it developed the universally latent passion in the breast of social man for spectacle in general, and for dramatic spectacle especially for its own sake. Here again was the strongest encouragement of all for the clergy to persevere in their dramatic efforts. Finding the lively pleasure which the people took in this mode of receiving religious instruction, they were tempted to add, according to their barbarous ability, embellishment after embellishment to the simple copies which they had originally presented of the most remarkable passages of Scripture story, until the profane exhibition itself, the miracle *play*, and not the subject of it, became the sole object of interest to the people who composed the audience at these representations, as, also, it certainly became the primary object of the greater part of the ecclesiastics who took part in getting them up."

While the nobles and the wealthy were regaled with the miracle plays on the scale above described, the villagers and townspeople had similar amusements of a humbler character. And these, also, were not only sanctioned, but got up by the clergy. In these amusements, puppets, and not living actors, took their parts, as the Punch and Judy of modern times. Thus, at Witney, in Oxfordshire, there was an annual representation of the Resurrection, in which the priests in that neighbourhood arrayed certain puppets so as to represent the various characters mentioned in connection with that event in the Bible. There were also secular pageants, as at Chester, where, on the eve of the festival of St. John the Baptist, "setting the watch" was held, in which figures made of pasteboard, cloth, and other materials, representing four giants, a camel, a dromedary, a dragon, an ass, a unicorn, a flower-de-luce, six hobby-horses, and sixteen naked boys, were the dumb actors. Great importance seems to have been attached to this "setting the watch" by the good people of Chester; for though for a time it fell into disuse, owing to the religious zeal which displayed itself in the age of the Tudors, it was again revived in 1564, when new figures were constructed at a considerable expense, the four giants of pasteboard, etc., alone costing twenty pounds.

In the sedentary sports mentioned in the former periods, and which were still indulged in, may be mentioned that of card-playing. This amusement had been known and practised in France, Italy, Germany, and Spain in the previous century, and it seems probable that it was introduced into England through its wars with France. It is said that cards were invented by a painter in Paris, for the amusement of Charles VI. in his lucid intervals; and it is certain that they were used by him, for in his treasurer's accounts there is an item that sixty-six shillings were paid for three packs, "gilded with gold, and painted with diverse colours, and diverse devices." The first cards used were painted or illuminated by the hand like missals, and hence they were costly and beyond the reach of the multitude; but it would appear that the process of printing them had been adopted long before it was applied to the multiplication of books, after which they became more common. There is evidence that both card-making and card-playing were known and practised in 1463: that year, on an application of the card-makers of London, an Act was made against the importation of cards from abroad. At that time, they appear to have been manufactured by stamping the outlines of the figures on the card-board with wooden blocks, after which they were filled up with various colours by the hand. The chief games played with them at this time were "Tromp," and "Primero," which, simple as they were, became the ruin of many, for by the spirit of gambling which they engendered, many a hoarded treasure was dispersed, and many an estate changed ownership.

The active sports of the commonalty received several additions during this period. Among these may be mentioned wrestling, which appears to have been derived from the Greek Orthopale, and Anaclinopale, the two forms of which have been thus described by Homer:—

"Amid the ring each nervous rival stands,
Embracing rigid, with implicit hands;
Close-locked above, their hands and arms are mixt;
Below, their planted feet at distance fixt,

Like two strong rafters which the builder forms,
Proof to the wintry winds and howling storms:
Their tops connected, but at wider space
Fixed on the centre stands their solid base.
Now to the grasp each manly body bends;
The humid sweat from every pore descends:
Their bones resound with blows; sides, shoulders, thighs,
Swell to each gripe, and bloody tumours rise.
Nor could Ulysses, for his art renowned,
O'erturn the strength of Ajax on the ground;
Nor could the strength of Ajax overthrow
The watchful caution of his artful foe.
While the long strife even tires the lookers on,
Thus to Ulysses spoke great Telamon:
'Or let me lift thee, chief, or lift thou me;
Prove we our strength and Jove the rest decree.'
He said, and, straining, heaved him from the ground
With matchless strength; that time Ulysses found
The strength t'evade, and where the nerves combine
His ancle struck: the giant fell supine.
Ulysses, following, on his bosom lies:
Shouts of applause run rattling through the skies.
Ajax to lift Ulysses next essays;
He barely stirred him, but he could not raise;
His knee locked fast, the foe's attempt defied.
And, grappling close, they tumbled side by side;
Defiled with honourable dust they roll,
Still breathing strife and unsubdued of soul."

As in the funeral games to which this description refers, there were public competitions in this exercise for prizes—a ram or a cock—in which the men of Cornwall and Devonshire especially excelled. From a law in the reign of Edward IV. to restrain people from various sports, and to encourage archery, we find that the game of quoits was common, which appears also to have been derived from the Greeks, who, according to the Homeric page, practised pitching the quoit at that time with large stones or rude masses of iron; but in later times the disk varied greatly, both in shape, size, and materials, the most common being a cycloid, swelling in the middle and growing thin towards the edges. From the same law we find that the game of football was practised, which Daniel Souter contends was the *Episkyros* of the Greeks. It was a rough and dangerous sport, and it may still be witnessed in certain towns in South Wales on Shrove Tuesday. It is played by a ball made of a bull's bladder, which, after being blown tight, is covered with a thick coating of leather. On the morning of Shrove Tuesday every window in the town is closed, and the game commences by throwing the ball up in front of the town-hall, when, the players divided into two parts, commence the contest: one party striving to kick it to one end of the town, and the other to kick it to the other extremity of the town. The struggle is kept up the whole day, during which many kicks and blows are exchanged, the combatants recruiting their strength from time to time by copious horns of ale and pancakes, which are sold at the corner of every street. Sometimes the ball is kicked right over the houses into the townsmen's gardens, whither it is followed by crowds of young men, who, on such occasions, are privileged to invade their properties.

Another game which became common in this period—Hoodman Blind, or Blindman's Buff—was also evidently derived from the Greek Muïnda, and, like that, appears to have been played in various forms, the most simple of which was for a boy blindfolded to move about spreading his hands and crying "Beware!" and if he caught any one skipping about him, to place his captive in his place as Hoodman Blind. "Trundling the hoop," which is now first mentioned, appears likewise to have been derived from the Greeks, for the hoop is enumerated among the playthings of Hellenic children. Other games which now became common, were "bowling," in which the player used three bowls instead of one as in the modern game, and various games of ball, some of which, as "trap-and-bat," and "club-ball," were similar to those of the present day. To these may be added "prisoner's base" or "bars," "leaping through a hoop," and "battledore and shuttle-cock," which are too well known to need description. Of a more formidable character was the game of "quarter-staff," a game which was peculiarly English. It was played with a heavy staff about five or six feet in length, which the player grasped firmly in one hand, while the other traversed to either end of the weapon according to that with which he wished to strike his antagonist. It was an instrument both of defence and attack, for, with a turn of the wrist, it described a wide circle, and guarded the player on every side; while its motion was so rapid that it required a keen eye and a nimble foot to avoid its blows. This sport retained its popularity for several centuries, and until very recently was one of the most attractive games at fairs and holiday-meetings.

The Christmas pastimes of this period were of a peculiar character. Men with blackened and paint-bedaubed faces, so that they could not be recognized, went from house to house and made merry with the inmates, and free with their viands; and in some parts, especially in the north of England, men and women exchanged dresses, and sallied forth to make mirth among their neighbours and partake of their Christmas cheer. But the most popular pastime was the "fools-dance," in which persons, dressed like a court-fool, danced to the sound of music played by musicians habited in the same grotesque style. The real or professional fool in this age and down to a later period was an important personage, especially the court-fool. Without the mirth he created, pageants and sports would have been but tame affairs. It was his business, when spirits grew dull, to enliven them—to amuse his master by broad jokes upon his courtiers, and even upon the royal administration. No one took offence at what he did or said. The more he jingled the bells attached to his motley yellow-fringed garments and flourished his bauble, which was a staff with a blown bladder or zany head at the top of it, and the more he shook his ass's ears and cracked his practical jokes, the more the host and his guests admired him. He was a "fellow of infinite mirth," who could always set "the table in a roar." Men of all moods of mind, from the grave to the gay, honoured the fool, although he might utter "quips and cranks" at their expense. He had an all-licensed lip, and could do as he pleased, as Lodge, in his "Wits' Miserie," published in the Tudor period, testifies. "The fool," he says, "is in person comely—in apparel courtly—but in behaviour a very ape and no man. His employment is to coin bitter jests, and to sing profligate songs and ballads. Give him a little wine in his head, he is constantly fleering and making mouths: he laughs intemperately at every little occasion, and dances about the house, leaps over tables, outstrips men's heads, trips up his

companion's heels, and burns sack with a candle." Lodge describes him as performing many a madcap and mischievous feat which cannot be here enumerated, and more than hints that, in the midst of all, his morals "lose all quality of fastidiousness." But this is the grosser part of his character. In the midst of the fool's folly, words of wisdom often fell from his lips. Fuller observes of the duties of a chief jester, that he only who had wit could perform them well, and that only he who wanted it would perform them. This may be true, but under his folly and caustic insolence it was his duty to whisper useful truths in the royal ear, and there are many instances on record which prove that he performed that duty faithfully. It took a wise man to make a court-fool, and that he was held in high estimation is clear from the largesses he sometimes obtained from his royal master. His very memory was sometimes cherished with affection and regret. Hence it is that Shakspeare makes the distracted Lear exclaim mournfully, "And my poor fool is hanged!"

The manners and customs of Scotland during this period were still indicative of a rude condition of society. The wars and misfortunes in which that country had, during the preceding age, been involved, had proved adverse to the progress of civilization. As might have been expected, James I., who had been so long acquainted with the greater refinements in England, and had imbibed a taste for them, on returning to his throne sought to introduce some of them among his subjects, but with very little effect. His attempt to introduce a more luxurious mode of living than had formerly been known gave great offence to many of the nobles. Wardlaw, bishop of St. Andrew's, it is said, returned to lecture James in a Parliament at Perth on the subject; and, adopting his views, that Parliament passed an Act for regulating the manner in which persons of all orders should live: pies and baked meats, then first known in Scotland, being especially prohibited to all ranks beneath that of a baron. That even the royal living was wanting, not only in refinement but decent comfort, is exemplified by the banquet given on the marriage of James II. with Mary of Gueldres in 1449—the chief dishes being a boar's head painted and stuck full of coarse bits of flax, which was served up in a huge platter, surrounded with thirty-two banners, bearing the arms of the king and his chief nobility. It is said that this banquet lasted five hours, during which huge bowls of wine were quaffed, even by prelates, without spilling a drop, to the no small astonishment and probably disgust of the queen and those knights of Gueldres who had accompanied Mary to her Scottish home. The feasts of the border chieftains were especially rude—their meats being served up in shapeless masses, and hacked in pieces by the knives and daggers of their guests. By some of the higher nobility, however, something like magnificence was added to their rude cheer, for it is recorded of the Douglases that their feasts were accompanied with the music of timbrels and trumpets. The fool, also, was a usual appendage to a Scottish nobleman's establishment, and the minstrel and the juggler were well known personages. Some of the minstrels of Scotland sang only sacred songs; but others, who were chiefly Irishmen and Highlanders, indulged in ballad singing, and the recitation of tales of love and war and bold adventure.

During this period the Scottish nobles, like those of England, were attended by bands of numerous retainers. The earls of Douglas seldom had less than twelve hundred horsemen in attendance upon them when they rode forth; and others of the nobility had followers in proportion to their means. But this does not appear to have arisen so much from a love of pomp as from necessity, for in these turbulent times their dignity and even their safety depended on the number of their military retainers. The power they displayed was often dangerous to the royal authority, and attempts were made by legal enactments to limit the number of their followers, but they proved abortive. These enactments set forth that in order to prevent the outrages which were daily committed throughout the kingdom, no person travelling should have a greater number of attendants than he was able to maintain from his own resources, by which it would appear that some of the armed followers of the nobles were not actually in their pay, but assumed their liveries for their own private purposes.

As regards the dwellings of the people of Scotland, according to Æneas Sylvius, they were in the reign of James I. in a rude condition; those in the towns being built of stone without lime, and those in villages roofed with turf and having only a cowhide for the door. The same authority tells us that though the Scots had flesh and fish in abundance, bread was an absolute scarcity among them. But though the dwellings of the Scots may have been rude, and their diet coarse, there were still indications of a growing refinement in this age. Under their adverse circumstances it might have been supposed that there was no need of any sumptuary laws to define what dress the people was or was not to wear. But this was not the case. In the year 1457 the sumptuous clothing, both of men and women, especially in boroughs, called forth a stringent enactment against it; an enactment which proves that the burghers, with their wives and daughters, had begun to dress like lords and ladies, for they were henceforth prohibited from wearing clothes of silk, scarlet gowns, and costly furs. If the Scottish burghers dressed thus sumptuously in the reign of James II., it may be presumed that some refinements had also taken place in their in-door life and accommodations. Nor can it be conceived that the people of Scotland, who are said to have exercised unbounded hospitality from the highest to the lowest, could have been, as a rule, wanting in the necessaries of life as some have represented. It is said that travellers and strangers always found a ready entertainment at private houses wherever they sojourned. By a law of James I. it was ordered that hostelries should be erected throughout the kingdom, in which those who travelled were to lodge and refresh themselves at a reasonable cost; but so deep-rooted was the virtue of hospitality among the people, that although a subsequent enactment on the complaint of those who kept the newly-erected hostelries that they could find no customers imposed penalties upon both private hosts and their guests, its rites were still exercised with unbounded liberality.

Chivalry in Scotland during the fifteenth century was the counterpart of that which was practised in England. Tilts and tournaments were held both by kings and nobles. James I. was renowned for his dexterity in tilting; and the Scottish knights were held in high esteem, by friends and foes, for their knightly accomplishments. In war and peace they were gallant, courteous, and brave. Similar ordeal combats were also of frequent occurrence in Scotland to those which have been described in England. Combats of this character often took place between the English and the Scots living on the borders, chiefly arising from the stealing of each other's cattle. On these occasions, when either party felt himself aggrieved, he made his charge, and summoned the accused to battle. If the summons was obeyed, there was a fair field and a fair fight, but if it was refused, as sometimes happened, a novel mode of purgation was adopted. The stolen cattle were driven into the river which formed the frontier line, whether it was the Esk or the Tweed, and if they reached the opposite shore from whence they had been taken, whether of England or Scotland, they were adjudged to the claimant, and if they were drowned before they reached the middle of the stream, the defendant had to pay their value; but if on the other hand they returned to that side of the river from whence they had been driven, the thief, whether English or Scot, retained them as his own property. Whatever was the result of this very uncertain ordeal, it was by common consent deemed infallible.

The nobles of Scotland were not much addicted to sports and pastimes. The game of war was far more popular with them than hunting and hawking. Occasionally, however, in times of peace, although they had no very keen relish for them, they indulged in those aristocratic amusements. The wardens of the Scottish marches had a sport peculiarly their own, and one in which they particularly delighted. This was the hunting of border thieves, a sport which required no mean skill and agility, for their game was not easily driven to cover. Among the common people the principal sports were of an athletic character; as running, leaping, wrestling, racing, throwing bars and weights, and golf or bandy-ball. Attempts were made by James I. and II. to substitute archery for the popular sports of their subjects; but although butts were ordered to be erected at every parish church, and it was ordained that every man was to practise shooting every holiday or forfeit twopence each time he failed to appear, archery never took any deep root among the pastimes of Scotland. The object which these monarchs had in view in thus endeavouring to promote archery was to introduce the bow and the arrow into the ranks of their warriors; but the long spear and the battle-axe still continued to be the principal weapons of these brave and hardy Northmen.

END OF VOL. I.